

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WORLD POPULATION PROBLEMS
AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Peace Through Law Education Fund, I take great pleasure in inserting into the *RECORD* the remarks of Ambassador Richard Elliot Benedick at the January meeting of the food and population series sponsored by the fund.

Ambassador Benedick is the coordinator of population affairs at the Department of State. Recent travels throughout Europe and Asia and extensive interviews with health and population officials in those regions qualify him to speak on international trends in population policy. His address underscores the need to coordinate population policy with development policy.

I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

I am delighted and honored to be asked to join you this morning, particularly in view of the traditional leading role of the U.S. Congress, for more than a decade, in forcing oftentimes timid Administrations to focus on population issues. I would like to share with you today some personal impressions of the relevance of population to U.S. foreign policy. I do this with some diffidence, because so much has been said and written on population by professionals, and I am neither a demographer nor a population expert. However, my experience in foreign affairs has made it clear to me for many years that population growth vitally affects U.S. foreign policy objectives of global peace and security, economic and political stability, and human rights and dignity.

Simply put, the proposition I would like to offer you is that there is no other single issue which will so much influence the kind of world which our nation will face, and the kind of life which our children and their children will have to cope with, as this factor of population growth. There is no precedent for this phenomenon in the history of our planet. This simple fact cannot be overstated, it cannot be ignored.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION

It took the human race hundreds of thousands of years to reach, early in the last century, the first billion in number. The fourth billion was added in only 15 years, from 1960 to 1975, and nearly two billion more will be added by the end of this century, just two decades away. There is no dispute among demographers about the numbers; barring natural disaster or holocaust, the current world population of about 4.3 billion will grow to over six billion by the year 2000. This is the equivalent of more than twenty new countries the size of Bangladesh—and just about as poor, since 90 percent of the growth will take place in the world's poorest countries.

The news media have made much fanfare about the "end of the population crisis," be-

cause the overall growth rate appears to have peaked. Yet, even projecting a continuing decline in this growth rate, the fact is that in absolute numbers more people will be added to the world's population in the year 2000 than were added last year. This is so because of the built-in demographic momentum: tomorrow's parents are already born—45-50 percent of the current population of developing countries is under 15 years of age, still to enter their reproductive years. Even if these future parents sharply reduce their fertility, the sheer numbers of this generation ensure a continuing growth momentum for several decades.

Let me illustrate in concrete terms the effects of this momentum. A given population does not begin to stabilize until it has reached what is known as a replacement level of fertility, which means, for practical purposes, an average of one daughter born to each woman. When this is achieved, the demographic momentum continues to fuel population growth for several decades (50-70 years) before the population ultimately stabilizes. Let us look at Mexico, with a 1975 population of 62 million. If replacement level of fertility is reached by the year 2000, which would require strenuous efforts, Mexico's population would eventually stabilize 60-70 years later at approximately 175 million. If there were a delay of only 20 more years in reaching the replacement level of fertility, that is, by 2020, Mexico's population would not stabilize until it reaches 270 million.

Looking at the global picture, where will this planet's population eventually stabilize? Optimists say somewhere over 8 billion, if the one-daughter-per-woman norm is reached by the end of this century. The United Nations estimates 11-12 billion, others foresee 15 billion or more. Thus, at least a doubling of the planet's current population is inevitable, built into the demographic dynamics. At issue is whether the world's inhabitants will triple—to 12 billion—or more, a result which will depend on hundreds of millions of family decisions over the coming decades.

For global population will eventually stabilize—one way or another. The relevant question is: under what conditions of human life will this take place? Many observers seriously question the ability of our planet to support much more than six billion at anything near current standards of living.

INTERNATIONAL COMPLACENCY

It is a fallacy to consider population as a long-term problem: it is an urgent problem, because delays in achieving the replacement level of fertility are portentous. I submit to you that the reality of this situation, the gravity and urgency of the problem facing our generation, has not sufficiently penetrated and permeated either public consciousness or the councils of national leaders. There is a recognition in the abstract, but an unwillingness to accord top priority to fertility-reducing programs and policies. This is so because the effects of population growth are so gradual that they are beyond the time horizon of most political leaders. Other pressing problems crowd in for their attention—the immediate takes priority over the essential.

So, I see a certain complacency in the world's attitude toward population growth. In industrialized countries, assistance for

population and family planning programs, and for biomedical research in contraception has, to be sure, grown over the past decade. But it is at derisory levels in comparison with total foreign aid and total medical research expenditures. In less developed countries, there is all too often lip-service to the importance of population in development, but no real integration of population programs into development strategy; a modest family planning program is tucked away somewhere in the health ministry, reaching only a relatively insignificant proportion of the populace. At UN meetings, there is perhaps a passing reference to population in conferences on development or food or environment, but many Third World politicians seem far more interested in presenting lists of demands than in acknowledging the need for common efforts in reducing fertility. Even our own President's Commission on World Hunger, in its preliminary report, somehow relegated the population factor to a position of such inexplicable obscurity that even the Washington Post felt constrained to comment on this treatment in a recent editorial.

The numbers I have described above have profound implications for our national interests on a planet which, we increasingly recognize, is a finite one. A few years ago, the Rockefeller Commission concluded that there is hardly a problem we face which would not be easier to resolve if population problems were lessened. It is worth underscoring the fact that there are no energy or resource problems per se, but only in relation to numbers of people. If the world does not address the underlying cause, our efforts will continually lag behind growing imbalances and strains. Let us look at some of these subjects individually.

POPULATION AND OTHER GLOBAL ISSUES

Food and Hunger: World Bank President McNamara and FAO Director-General Saouma have recently tried to call the world's attention to the fact that food production is not keeping pace with population growth in most parts of the world. From 1970 through 1977, per capita food output in the market-economy developing countries rose at an annual rate of only 0.2 percent, and dependence by these countries on food imports trebled. Norman Borlaug, pioneer of the "Green Revolution," has cautioned that innovations in agricultural technology can only buy limited time to control population increases. According to UNICEF, tens of millions of children are dying annually of malnutrition and related causes.

Health: WHO studies indicate that pregnancies during teenage and after thirty, close spacing of children, and numbers of children (above three) all have demonstrable adverse effects on the health of both mothers and children. In many countries, a leading cause of death among young women is complications from primitive abortions to prevent the birth of unwanted children. In some parts of the world, mortality rates appear to be rising as a result of malnutrition, diseases related to crowded living conditions, and effects of frequent pregnancies in weakening both mothers and infants.

Illiteracy: UNESCO estimates that the numbers of illiterate are rising from the current 700 million to approximately one billion by the year 2000; there is evidence that female illiteracy may rise to over 60

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

percent in the poorer countries by that time.

Urbanization: Flight from rural areas plus natural growth in already overcrowded cities is causing a virtual urban explosion in the Third World. In only twenty years, some 40 LDC cities will contain over 5 million inhabitants each; half of these will be over 10 million, including Mexico City at 32 million, Calcutta 20 million, Bombay 19 million, Karachi 16 million. By the year 2000, three-fourths of the population of Latin America will be living in cities. Provision of jobs, housing, and social services to numbers of this magnitude, over such a short period of time, presents difficulties hitherto unimagined by town planners and governments.

Employment: ILO estimates that in the next two decades approximately 700 million more people will enter the labor pool of developing countries—this is more than the total current labor force of the industrially advanced countries. The amount of investment required to put these numbers of people to work is astronomical. And, this comes on top of unemployment/underemployment reaching 40 percent in many areas.

Environment/Resources: The world's per capita output from grasslands, croplands, fisheries, and forests has already peaked in recent years, when global population was between 3 and 4 billion. Problems of water pollution, soil erosion, and deforestation are becoming major international issues as a consequence of overintensive farming, overgrazing, encroachment of cities, and uncontrolled industrialization.

Inflation: Recent studies suggest that the contemporary phenomenon of worldwide inflation is being affected by rising demand associated with the vast increases in population. Many commodities are becoming more costly as supplies dwindle or fail to keep pace with rising demand, or as they become more expensive to obtain. The case of energy prices is only the most obvious example: a depleting resource in the face of rising demand, enormous investments required to tap new sources or to achieve a technological breakthrough, and inflationary repercussions throughout the rest of the economy, including the critical food-producing sector. A recent Worldwatch study concludes that "everywhere one turns, limits are being encountered and the effects are being compounded * * * it seems clear that the world is entering a new period of scarcity."

All of these factors add up to a situation of increased potential for social unrest, political instability, mass migrations, and conflicts in a possible scramble for land and resources. We already see signs, in one part of the world or another, of breakdowns of order and services, difficulties in governance, and strains to democratic institutions. It is clear that the U.S. has national security as well as economic interests affected by conditions which are aggravated by population growth. Disorders abroad will affect our own unemployment situation, inflation rate, and the prices and availability of critical industrial raw materials.

THE COLOMBO DECLARATION

The situation is grave, but it is not hopeless. What is required are determined and sustained global efforts, as a matter of top priority, to address population issues. I would like to suggest that the U.S. Congress once again, as in the past, might consider taking the initiative—an initiative already sanctioned by international consensus. In Sri Lanka last September, the first International Conference of Parliamentarians, representing approximately 60 countries, issued

a bold document, which has become known as the Colombo Declaration. Its main elements are:

A reaffirmation of the World Population Plan of Action, originally ratified by 136 nations in 1974 at Bucharest; in particular; the basic human right of individuals and families to decide freely the number and spacing of their children, and the corollary responsibility of governments to provide them with the information and means to do so.

A call on world leaders, development banks, UN agencies, and religious leaders to recognize the importance of population factors in development strategies.

A recommendation to strengthen the role of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

An increase in external assistance for population programs from the current \$400 million annual level to \$1 billion annually by 1984.

Greater priority to research in contraceptive development.

An acknowledgement of the role of women in development as a critical factor for reducing fertility rates.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION

How could the U.S. Government take up the challenge of Colombo? We can work on several fronts, and the role of Congress is a critical one.

1. International Resolutions: U.S. delegations to international meetings should strive to put population at the forefront of the world's agendas. It is important to get appropriate resolutions and/or communiqués in such forums as the Special Session of the UN General Assembly next summer, the World Health Assembly, the UN Conference on Women, the Venice Economic Summit next June. Doing this will help to create an international atmosphere and consensus which can encourage and make it politically easier for national leaders to take steps to initiate or upgrade programs and policies to limit fertility in their countries.

2. Bilateral and Multilateral Population Aid: There is clear evidence that family planning programs do work. Something important is happening, particularly in Asia and parts of Latin America, when hundreds of thousands of people seek out family planning advice and services, often trekking for hours or days. There are several success stories, including China, South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, Colombia, Chile. But globally, only the fringes of the problem are being addressed, especially in South Asia, the Near East, and Africa. There are many reasons for this, including the logistical difficulties of reaching tens of thousands of scattered villages, the lack of trained paramedical field workers, the indifference of elites and officials, often the opposition of the medical profession, and a pervasive fatalism compounded by lack of knowledge.

The world's goal must be to extend family planning information and services to all peoples as a matter of urgent global priority. To reach this goal, the United States should consider:

A significant expansion of U.S. bilateral population assistance beyond the current \$200 million annually;

An insistence that the rest of our aid support and reinforce demographic objectives (along the lines of 104(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act);

A major increase in U.S. support to the UNFPA, which is one of the better UN organizations; it is innovative, active in countries where it is difficult for us to be, and exerts a significant multiplier effect in attracting funds from such other donors as Germany, Japan, and OPEC.

3. Biomedical Research: Finally, we

cannot ignore the serious disadvantages of all existing contraceptive methods from the standpoints of safety, acceptability, and effectiveness, as manifested in unacceptably high discontinuance rates. I have become personally concerned over the state of our scientific knowledge in this area. There is a need to adapt existing contraceptive technology to the particular physiological and social conditions of developing countries. We simply need more options.

The potential benefits to all mankind from a scientific breakthrough here seems to me enormous and wide-reaching, in comparison with many types of disease-related research which attract more funding. Yet, there is a tragic inattention to this subject: contraceptive-related research currently attracts less than two percent of total medical research funding. Scientists have told me that there is a correlation between amount of funding and the extent that top-quality research talent is attracted to a given field. Moreover, we cannot expect the private sector to bring forth sustained financing because of the uncertainty, commercial unprofitability, and long lead-times involved.

Therefore, the U.S. Government should consider a substantial increase in biomedical research funding to HEW/National Institutes of Health and to AID for basic human reproductive physiology and applied contraceptive development. As the House Select Committee concluded last year, "There are few areas in which a strong commitment of American scientific expertise and resources could contribute more to overall health and welfare, both in the United States and the world as a whole."

These, then, are possible programs. We must not lose sight of the fact that what we are involved in is not a numbers game, but rather a fundamental effort directed at improving human lives and securing human rights and dignity. As former British Prime Minister Heath told the Parliamentarians at Colombo: time is not on our side, and future generations will rightly blame us if we fail our responsibility.●

VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT OF 1980

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT of Arkansas, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, today introduced the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1980. This bill provides that veterans' benefits shall be denied any individual whose discharge from the Armed Forces is characterized as being for misconduct, unsuitability, marginal performance of duty, or other reason indicating that the service of the individual demonstrated that the individual was unqualified for retention in the Armed Forces. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I commend Congressman HAMMERSCHMIDT for his leadership in the area of veterans' benefits.

The Subcommittee on Special Investigations, of which I am ranking minority member, held hearings last fall on Congressman ROBIN BEARD's bill,

H.R. 4367, to deny veterans' benefits to those failing to complete their initial period of enlistment. During the course of these hearings, it became evident that there was a need, due to the changed nature of the military discharge system, for something other than mere characterization of a discharge to determine who receives benefits on the basis of meritorious service.

The demise of the draft and the advent of the all-volunteer military has inflicted many unforeseen problems upon both the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. The primary source of these problems is those volunteer members of the Armed Forces who fail to complete their initial—contractual—period of obligated service.

In its report to the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Subcommittee on Special Investigations recommended that the term "veteran" be changed, to reflect that in order for an individual to be termed a veteran, a minimum period of obligated peace-time service would be required.

The Veterans' Benefits Act of 1980 is, in my opinion, a much sounder and more equitable one, which preserves historic definitions while barring those who have not earned benefits from receiving them. Additionally, substantial budgetary savings should result to both the VA and the DOD.●

THE PEOPLE OF AFGHANISTAN COURAGEOUSLY RESISTING SOVIET TYRANNY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the brutal Soviet invasion of its neighbor Afghanistan was a reminder to all of us in the free world of the tyrannical nature of Mr. Brezhnev, his government, and international communism. But we know that the fires of a nation's longing to be free cannot be easily put out. The story of an Afghan diplomat's dramatic public renunciation of the Red Army's invasion of his country bears witness to the courage of the Afghan people and their fight against Soviet imperialism. That story was set forth in a news article in the Chicago Sun-Times and subsequently used to illustrate the U.S.S.R.'s unending difficulties in subjugating Afghanistan in a Chicago Tribune editorial, both of which follow:

SOVIETS HIT AS AFGHAN QUIT AT U.N.

NEW YORK.—An official representative of the Afghan government stunned a United Nations meeting of non-aligned nations Friday when he denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and resigned his post.

Abdul-Rahmin Ghafoorzai asked the 96-member group to send an urgent appeal to Kabul for the safety of his wife and four children in Kabul.

The meeting unanimously approved the proposal, and Ambassador Raoul Roa of Cuba, an ally of the Soviet Union, had no alternative but to send the cable.

Ghafoorzai, an 11-year career diplomat said he decided some time ago to condemn the December invasion of Afghanistan but had to wait for an "appropriate international gathering."

"I ask the non-aligned nations to take effective action against the invasion of my beloved country, which was trampled under the heels of the Red Army," he told a hastily summoned news conference.

Ghafoorzai conceded that the pro-Soviet coup in 1978 "involved some reforms which had the support of the Afghan people." But by now, he said, "even the Soviet Union realizes it cannot convince the world it is there because of imperialist intervention, and the liberation of struggle under way will convince the Russians to withdraw."

MR. BREZHNEV'S CHUTZPAH

Until now, the ultimate in chutzpah was the man who murdered his parents and then pleaded for mercy on the grounds that he had been orphaned. But Leonid Brezhnev may have set a new standard for that splendid Yiddish word. He has declared, with a straight face, that "we will be ready to commence the withdrawal of our troops as soon as all forms of outside interference directed against the government and people of Afghanistan are fully terminated."

Outside interference against the government of Afghanistan? No fewer than 70,000 Soviet troops are in Afghanistan to support a puppet government that replaced an earlier puppet government, the leader of which was summarily executed on Soviet orders.

And outside interference against the people of Afghanistan? At the very moment Mr. Brezhnev was speaking Soviet troops and tanks were pouring into Kabul to enforce martial law declared because the "people of Afghanistan" rose up in strike and riot against the Soviet presence in their country.

The people of Afghanistan are inflicting such heavy losses on Soviet forces, in fact, that Mr. Brezhnev's government has had to acknowledge publicly that Afghan resistance is stronger than expected. The puppet president of Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal, is having trouble finding enough Afghans to man his government. A cabinet meeting last week erupted in gunfire that resulted in the evacuation of two top officials to hospitals in Moscow, one suffering from what characteristically imaginative Soviet officials described as "stomach trouble." [One or both of them may have died.] And on Friday Afghan diplomat Abdul Rahim Ghafoorzai, handpicked by the Soviets to "explain" the Soviet invasion at the United Nations, chose to defect instead, calling the invasion "an illegal action, an unjustifiable action, a miscalculation, and a grave mistake."

By "outside interference" Mr. Brezhnev was referring, of course, to weapons being supplied to Afghan rebels by, among others, the United States and China. But as Mr. Brezhnev knows, those supplies did not begin until the Soviet Union had already so interfered in the internal affairs of Afghanistan that hundreds of thousands of Afghans had taken up arms against it. Certainly there can be no comparison between the small arms being given to the rebels and the vast quantities of sophisticated weapons—including helicopter gunships, tanks, rockets, and napalm bombs—the Soviets have introduced into the country.

Large as it is, though, the Soviet presence is not sufficient to control a country that is notoriously ungovernable even in the quiet-

est of times. One senior official in Washington says that the Russians would need 400,000 troops to achieve their goal of conquest. That would produce a level of fighting and bloodshed that would make the Soviet Union even more of an international pariah than it is already. And even then there would be no certainty that a conquered Afghanistan would stay conquered for long.

So if Mr. Brezhnev's chutzpah can't help him, perhaps his memory can. There is a precedent for the situation in which his army finds itself, and the precedent is not America in Viet Nam. It is the Soviet Union in Finland. The Red Army attacked that small but courageous neighbor in 1939 and suffered a humiliating defeat. As time goes on, the Kremlin may wish it had retreated from Afghanistan when it could do so with reasonable dignity and left the Afghans to the sequestered independence they so greatly treasure.●

A VOICE OF REASON ON SCHOOL PRAYER

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Katherine Bridge, sent me a copy of the following letter. It is her reply to a Martha Rountree, president of the Leadership Foundation, a private group in this city determined to have Congress overturn the Supreme Court by allowing prayer in public schools.

Mrs. Bridge, who taught public school for 30 years, offers a refreshing, reasoned view of the school prayer issue. Her opinion is worth sharing with my colleagues, particularly those who see all opponents of school prayer as godless, un-American, left-wing radicals.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1980.

Dear Mrs. Rountree: Your letter concerning School Prayer was carefully read and you have stated that you value the opinions of other loyal, law-abiding American citizens. I ask that you take "7 minutes" to read my letter as carefully as I read yours, and to have the courtesy to answer mine.

As a former public school teacher, with 30 years experience in a metropolitan area where I dealt with children, and adults, of many races and religions, and as a mother of two, and a grandmother of six, I feel qualified to give an opinion based on both experience and observation.

The American Public Schools, and the teaching staff, are expected to provide an atmosphere where the philosophy of respect for law and order, self-respect, respect for others, a love of learning, and the appreciation of excellence can be accompanied by good teaching of both basic and higher education.

Prayer, as well as religion in general, is a very private expression of one's desire to find answers to questions that have been asked ever since mankind was endowed with an inquisitive brain, and the ability to contemplate, and to reason.

Because mankind is so diversified, this religious expression has been developed in many forms. Neither the method of praying, including bodily positions, nor the content of prayers, has ever been the same

among the many races and philosophies of the peoples of our earth.

Recognizing these basic differences in people, our constitution specifically, and intentionally separated church and school in order to give Americans of all races and religions the freedom to worship as they so desired. It is a cornerstone of our American philosophy of personal freedom.

Asking teachers to conduct, and children to take part in a prayer session in the schoolroom, is to deny these children their privacy of expression in the manner their families have chosen.

You have cited the problems in our schools. Public prayer will not solve these deep-rooted problems. Drugs, sex, violence, etc. in our so-called "jungles" will not disappear until American citizens, including our legislators, judges, public officials, business people, school staffs, and parents clean up the corruption and the disrespect for law in their own lives.

Compulsory Public Prayer may very well add just one more cause for conflict among our citizens.

Have you forgotten that our churches are still open, and still free to conduct public group prayers—each in its own manner?

May I ask, "How much time have you spent reading, observing, and consulting with different religious groups in order to understand and appreciate the very complex make-up of our American population?"

We have thousands of well-behaved and studious young people in our schools whose religions, beliefs, and practices may differ greatly from yours. Are you going to deny them religious freedom in place and manner of prayer?

In conducting a prayer session in a classroom, in all fairness to all religions, one must honor, and accept kneeling, sitting, prostrating, ablutions, prayer shawls, skull caps, prayer beads, rosaries, prayer wheels, prayer rugs, chanting, singing etc., etc. Are you thinking only in terms of your own religious upbringing?

Are you aware of, and tolerant toward those who are just as sincere as you are, and live just as fine lives as you do, but differ in their manner of worship?

I do not expect to change your opinions, but I do feel you should know the reasons why so many loyal, law-abiding, and intelligent American citizens do not wish to sponsor a law which will solve no basic problem, but will create severe, and unnecessary conflict in our schools among the diversified American people—both teachers, and families of our pupils.

Let us keep as many of our personal freedoms as we can, and impose as few mandatory rules and regulations as possible!

Let us attack the real roots of our problems, not try to solve them with a panacea!

Please believe me—I am not a "left-wing activist" (to use the language of Strom Thurmond), and I do not have any respect for persons who use the tactics of Madalyn O'Hair.

I am a conservative, sincere person who wishes to sponsor legislation which will really solve our problems, not add to them. Since I have tried to answer your questions, would you do me the favor to answer mine, so that we may better understand each other?

ANOTHER SIDE OF THE OLYMPIC BOYCOTT ISSUE

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

• Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker,

an article by Milton Richman, sports editor of United Press International, appeared in my local newspaper, the Meridian Star, recently concerning a boycott of the summer Olympic games in Moscow. Mr. Richman raised some points of which I was not aware. I think my colleagues will find that article interesting and informative and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

YOUTHFUL OLYMPIC ATHLETES MAKING BIG SACRIFICES?

NEW YORK.—Everytime some of our athletes start talking about how much of a "sacrifice" they've made preparing themselves for the Olympics in Moscow and what it'll do to their careers if they fail to go because of a boycott. I get all choked up inside.

Another way of putting it is that their extraordinary selfishness is such, it almost makes me gag.

The word "sacrifice" is easy to throw around. I doubt many of the Olympic aspirants who use the word can actually supply the literal meaning, which, according to the dictionary, is to give up something for an ideal or belief.

Somewhere along the way, everyone is called to make some kind of sacrifice. That's part of everyday life, but anytime I associate that word with sports, the five individuals who come most readily to mind are Ted Williams, Joe DiMaggio, Hank Greenberg, Bob Feller and Willie Mays.

This doesn't necessarily mean they were the only ones in sports, or even in baseball, who made sacrifices during World War II or the War in Korea, because there certainly were many others who also had their careers interrupted while going off to serve their country.

These five, however, are perfect examples for several reasons. First because each was a true superstar in every conceivable sense of the word; second, because each, by entering service, lost a splendid opportunity to break the most important records of his day; third, because the cost to each of the five, career-wise and money-wise, was, and still is even now, years later, incalculable, and finally, because each could've easily gone around moaning about what a tremendous sacrifice he made, but not one of them ever did.

Ted Williams gave up five years of his career with the Boston Red Sox by putting in not one, but two, separate hitchhikes as a Marine pilot. His air craft was hit by ground fire while he was on a mission in Korea and after crash landing the flaming jet, he skidded 2,000 feet along the runway before managing to get out alive. I wonder what some of our Olympic hopefuls, who complain about a boycott, would have to say about Ted Williams?

Or about Joe DiMaggio, who went off to the army for three years right at the peak of his career with the New York Yankees.

Bob Feller was only 23 when he entered the Navy and remained in it for nearly four years. Feller wasn't given any soft duty either. He was a guncrew chief on the U.S.S. Alabama and earned eight battle stars. Before going into the Navy, he had won 24, 27 and 25 games for the Cleveland Indians. The season he came back, he won only five. Feller finished with 266 victories. It's conceivable he would've approached 360 had he not been in service.

Willie Mays wound up with 660 home runs, only 54 short of Babe Ruth's record. Who's to say he couldn't have broken that record instead of Hank Aaron had he not put in nearly two years in the Army shortly after coming up with the New York Giants?

Hank Greenberg, who's 69, is one of the

best senior tennis players in the country now, having won the Dewars Cup six times in nine tries. Back in May of 1941, he was playing first base for Detroit and was the highest paid player in the majors when he became a private in the infantry at Fort Custer, Mich. Greenberg was only 30 then, still at the top of his career, and it looked as if he might have gotten a break when he was discharged seven months later under a provision releasing all those men over 28.

"I'll never forget the day I was discharged, December 5, 1941," he said as he sat alongside me recently on the plane coming back from the Super Bowl. "Two days later, I came down to the lobby of the hotel I was in and somebody said to me, 'Did you hear, the Japanese just bombed Pearl Harbor?'" Greenberg immediately reenlisted. This time he picked the Air Force, where he rose to the rank of captain, earned four battle stars, served in China and participated in the first land-based bombing of Japan in 1944.

In all the time he was in service, which was nearly five years, Greenberg told me he played baseball only once and that was while he was at Fort Custer. He did it as a favor for someone he knew who had a brother serving time at Jackson State Prison. Fort Custer was going to play the prison team and the man who knew Greenberg told him it would be a big feather in his brother's hat if Hank would play for the Army team.

"I agreed to do it," said Greenberg. "The Army didn't have a uniform that fit me, but when we got to Jackson State, the prisoners told me they had one that did, so I put it on. As long as I was wearing their uniform, I said I'd play first base for them, and I did. Generally, the prisoners told me they rooted for the visitors against their own team, but this time they really pulled for their own fellows."

Loudly cheered for every move he made, Greenberg went four-for-four to lead Jackson State to victory.

"That was the only time I ever played baseball in the Army," he said.●

NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

• Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the registration/draft/National Youth Service alternative debate, I would respectfully commend to the House a recent article by syndicated columnist Neal Peirce advocating the National Youth Service.

In the report just received from the President pursuant to Public Law 96-107, the administration concedes that National Youth Service, "is the most promising" of the various alternatives to the draft thus far proposed. The report of course also states: "There is no need for a national civilian service program at this time. The AVF (All-Volunteer Force) is adequate to meet projected personnel needs under present planning assumptions."

If the AVF is not adequate, however—and there would be no need for a return to registration if it were adequate—the National Youth Service concept is deserving of immediate and careful consideration.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Feb. 26, 1980]

THE RATIONALE FOR A DRAFT

(By Neal Peirce)

WASHINGTON.—If there were ever an idea whose time had come, the decades-old proposal for universal youth service by America's young people—either in military or civilian service work—should now qualify.

The darkening clouds of international tension, the severe problems of the all-volunteer Army, and President Carter's call for registration of young men and women as a possible prelude to resumption of the draft, all point in that direction.

But so, in an equally compelling way, does our domestic situation. Young people's services, especially in an era of high inflation and severe local budget cutbacks, are needed more than ever in every field from reforestation to care for the elderly, from neighborhood energy-saving programs to park maintenance, from day-care centers to tutoring of low-achievement students.

Rather than being victims of universal service, America's youth might benefit the most of all. They have grown up in the disillusioning times of Vietnam and Watergate. Little is asked of them now, except that they be consumers of goods and services. The inevitable results: political cynicism, feelings of powerlessness, and the corrosive "I'll get mine" materialism so rampant on college campuses today.

Universal service, by making it clear that every American has an obligation to his or her country, and that his or her services are needed by nation and community, might go far to shatter young people's self-absorption and tap the latent pool of idealism within them.

Several excellent proposals for national youth service have been advanced in recent years. But many youths suspected that national service was a cover for reinstating the draft. Little political support emerged.

The situation today is dramatically altered. The draft has suddenly become a clear and present threat for young people. And a strong case can be made that a well-conceived national service plan could avert—rather than cause—forced military conscription.

The most impressive and practical plan so far is a National Youth Service bill introduced by California's Rep. Paul N. McCloskey and a bipartisan group of House cosponsors. Every young person, male or female, would be required to register at 18. An ingenious system of carrot and stick inducements would come into play, with four options offered each registrant:

He or she could volunteer to serve in the armed forces for two years receiving a minimum subsistence wage (about \$200 monthly rather than the \$418 a month that must now be offered to attract Army recruits). A chief inducement: At the end of the two years the government would offer each military volunteer four years of college benefits.

Alternatively, the young person could agree to six months' active duty and then five and a half years as a reservist with an obligation, as McCloskey puts it, "to remain combat-ready, which means being able to run 20 miles a day, being ready to go into action on instant notice."

The third option would be a year of civilian service in any one of a myriad of programs sponsored by federal, state or local governments or private nonprofit agencies. Working at a subsistence wage, the young person could elect either community service (working in local hospitals, parks, coaching community sports teams and the like), or environmental service (trail maintenance, forest firefighting and similar programs).

There would be no special educational

benefits for the civilian volunteers. "It's only a year," McCloskey notes, "and we feel the civilian service is its own reward."

Finally, the 18-year-old could refuse to volunteer for any of the three major service opportunities. But that individual would then be subject to the draft (provided volunteer enlistments were insufficient) until his 24th birthday.

McCloskey presented the four alternatives to 115 members of a Washington student intern group. A remarkably high number, 66, said they would choose the two-year military service. Six picked the reserve, 43 said they would prefer civilian service. None picked the fourth option explains McCloskey. "Once you accept national service as an obligation, that four-year college benefit looks pretty good to many young people. And the uncertainty of being subject to the draft for six years is not very appetizing."

No one questions the immense obstacles—political, administrative, budgetary—to instituting full national youth service. But there would be great benefits. On the military side, there would be an infusion of middle-class youth into a volunteer Army now plagued by underenrollment, low skills, low morale, and an overrepresentation of poor and minority Americans. Increased military skill and combat readiness would create a more credible U.S. deterrent to foreign aggressions.

Domestically, cities and rural areas would receive a desperately needed stream of volunteer help. Many urban parks today, for instance, are in desperately rundown condition, at a time when the national interest demands better local recreation facilities so that people can avoid long, gasoline-consuming weekend and vacation trips.

Youth service would mix young people of all regions, races and classes in shared hard tasks and a common adventure—an experience all too many miss in our present stratified, and in many ways segregated, society. It would defuse the entire issue of registering women. Obviously, they should be part of a general youth service, and the chance of their ever being conscripted into the military would fall dramatically.

The choice between potential military conscription for an unlucky minority and a full youth service responding to a myriad of real national needs is a test-tube case of how the United States will respond to the difficult challenges of the 1980s.

One path represents timidity, divisiveness, inequity and selfish protection of one's own "rights." The other bespeaks confidence, unity, a sense of service and the common good and, after the traumas of the past two decades, a healthy and unsullied American patriotism.

RAPID POPULATION GROWTH IN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES: HOW IT AFFECTS THEIR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL GOALS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Peace Through Law Education Fund, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a new audiovisual project that graphically illustrates the adverse effects of high fertility and rapid population growth in Third World countries.

A demonstration of this project,

called RAPID, "Resources for the Awareness of Population Impact on Development," was made at the December meeting of the food and population series sponsored by the Peace Through Law Education Fund.

The purpose of the project, carried out by the futures group, is to show leaders of developing countries the nature and the magnitude of population factors that affect their progress toward economic and social goals.

High birth rates, declining death rates, the percentage of children in relation to the adult work force, and other information developed in the analysis for a country can be stored in an ordinary cassette or computer disk.

During the RAPID presentation, a computer, small enough to fit under an airplane seat, plays out in color the desired information on the large screen of a television set or monitor. The demographic and economic concepts conveyed are put on the screen one step at a time so they can be understood by observers with scant knowledge of demography.

The device can visually represent projections of a country's future population based on a two-child family by 2000, a three-child family by 2000, or the prevailing fertility level of six or seven children per family through the year 2000.

The population growth rate, depending on the fertility level, could be projected as a red line rising over the next 30 to 40 years. The future production of food in a developing country may be projected as a green line rising over the same time period. Food production per capita may then be projected as a rising—or a falling line.

More complex relationships may be presented including water availability per capita, the costs of primary and secondary school education, and the number of housing units needed for a country with a high or low population growth rate.

RAPID presentations have already been made for Jordan, Turkey, Egypt, Cameroon, Morocco, and Senegal. In the near future they will be shown to high officials in Honduras, Tanzania, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Panama, Sudan, Nepal, Ghana, Rwanda, and Sri Lanka.

AMERICA CANNOT REARM FAST—ONE REASON: COBALT

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, as America enters upon a new—post-Afghanistan invasion—era, a period of rearmament and defense mobilization, perhaps the most important question which we might ask ourselves is: Can it be done? In an article appearing in the February 4 issue of Business Week—subsequently reprinted in its

entirety in the Washington Post "Outlook" section of February 10—entitled: "Why the U.S. Can't Rarm Fast—The Defense Production Gap," that question is asked and answered in the negative.

Not surprisingly to those of my colleagues who have closely followed what can only be described as the national disgrace of America's nonexistent strategic and critical mineral policy, one of the central reasons behind America's inability to rearm fast is the critically tight supply of certain vital minerals such as cobalt. As the article points out:

The U.S. gets most of its cobalt from Zaire, which cut off its exports in 1978 during internal strife largely fomented by the Soviets.

The answer to such supply constraints is in part a reasonable approach to development of domestic sources. America has but one area containing economically viable cobalt deposits—the "cobalt trend" in and near the Blackbird Mine in Idaho. Yet parts of this cobalt trend may never be explored and developed if the 30,000 to 50,000 acres comprising the area is included in wilderness.

In the weeks ahead, the River of No Return Wilderness bill will come before the House. The Interior Committee voted last week by a margin of 23 to 15 to exclude from wilderness the Idaho cobalt trend for some of the very reasons discussed in the Business Week article. It is vital for America's future that that cobalt area remain in nonwilderness so that it might supply at least a part of America's needs for that essential mineral.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article, "Why the U.S. Can't Rarm Fast" in the RECORD at this point:

WHY THE U.S. CAN'T REARM FAST

For the first time since the hair-trigger Cuban missile crisis of nearly 18 years ago, the U.S. faces the very real possibility of a military showdown with the Soviet Union. While so far President Carter has only threatened further economic reprisals if the Soviets remain in Afghanistan, he has warned the Kremlin that the U.S. will take military action if Russian troops invade Pakistan or Iran. To back his policy, Carter is moving to beef up U.S. firepower as fast as he thinks the economy and his domestic programs can stand the strain. If the new military budgets are approved, the nation will spend \$100 billion more (in real dollars) for defense between now and 1985 than was previously planned.

But the defense speedup will be hard to accomplish. Much of the increased spending is to be for hardware—procurement of new weapons and stepups in the production rates of operational ones. There are grave doubts in Washington and in the defense industry that, barring declaration of a national emergency, the nation has the industrial capacity to produce enough hardware soon enough to count. While many of the prime defense contractors stand ready to mobilize their own facilities, the underlying industrial base has been allowed to deteriorate since the Vietnam war. Thus, most of the industry's subcontractors, who furnish materials, components, and subsystems for weapons, already have all of the work they can handle.

"We are already revved up to 100 percent

due to tremendous commercial demand," says Joseph R. Carter, chairman and chief executive of Wyman-Gordon Co., a major supplier of forgings. "If the military comes in on top with new requirements, there will be real problems."

Because the potential shortages cut to the core of the industrial economy, they will constrain the procurement of all types of military hardware. And there are few, if any, categories of weapons that would not need to be procured if the cold war continues to heat up. A near-term change in the Navy's shipbuilding program is unlikely. But to project U.S. power abroad, the Pentagon says, it will need more tactical aircraft, missiles, tanks, and guns, and the electronic systems to back them up. A strategic buildup now seems likely, too. And even ammunition may be a problem.

THE KEY PROBLEMS

The most severe constraints, though, will be on aerospace systems, because they must compete for resources with a superheated commercial aircraft business. The key problem areas:

Large forgings and castings: Only three U.S. suppliers, for example, can make the big forgings that are the backbone of today's airplanes.

Bearings: Some military aircraft later this year will be built without engines because strikes exacerbated a shortage of qualified suppliers of these parts.

Machining capacity: Spindle time is already short for the big, complex parts used in airframes, and new tools carry long delivery times.

Semiconductors: A growing shortage of integrated circuits is slowing the production of military electronic systems.

Metals: Titanium, cobalt, and chromium are all in critically tight supply; some specialty steels are also becoming very hard to get.

Manpower: Competition is already fierce for engineers, technicians, and skilled labor—especially on the West Coast.

The seriousness of the situation is indicated by the lead times on key aerospace items. Among the longest are those for heavy forgings, which can exceed two years. The wait for many castings is a year or more. Lead times for bearings and fasteners range from 30 weeks to more than three times that. Some types of machining jobs are being booked more than two years ahead.

"We have very little capability for surge production," says Lieutenant General Alton D. Slay, who heads the Air Force Systems Command. "It would take Draconian measures to get more military aircraft out of our industry beyond what it is now producing."

Such measures may yet come. "The Russian bear is out of the cage," says Dale W. Church, Deputy Under Secretary of defense for research and engineering and the Pentagon's procurement boss, "and we have got to be able to respond."

Most defense production experts believe that the Pentagon will have to use its power to set priorities to push military orders ahead of civilian orders. If it does, a big loser would be commercial aircraft production. And that, in turn, would have broader ramifications: commercial airplane sales accounted for \$9.5 billion on the plus side of the U.S. trade balance last year. And the airlines badly need the new, more efficient planes to cut their soaring energy costs.

In part, the industrial bottleneck is the result of on-again, off-again defense budgets. Thousands of suppliers dropped out of the defense business during the funding slump of the early 1970s, and others have been reluctant to gear up because they fear another bust. In addition, the defense delivery system is clogged with work on weapons

committed to overseas customers under the government-sponsored program of foreign military sales. Such sales have topped \$50 billion over the last five years.

But what really turned a tight supply situation into a full-scale crunch was the stepup in commercial aircraft production. Two years ago, Boeing Co., in particular, began to tie up subcontractors, labor, and materials for its new 757 and 767 airliners. Almost overnight, the industry's production rates tripled, and in 1980 commercial aerospace sales are expected to reach \$20.2 billion, topping sales of the defense segment for the first time.

At the same time, semiconductors—the vitals of such electronic systems as radars, underwater surveillance, and missile guidance—are in tight supply because of booming demand in autos, TV games, and other consumer markets. Lead times for deliveries of some integrated circuits now run to 12 months, compared to 5 a year ago, says Jack L. Bowers, CEO of Sanders Associates Inc.

The production jam finds the U.S. with its inventory of many tactical weapons at a low state. Washington would like to equip Pakistan with \$400 million worth of weapons—artillery, helicopters, antitank weapons, and fixed-wing aircraft—but it is clear that this could be done only by stripping them from U.S. forces, as was done to resupply Israel during the Yom Kippur war of 1973. "You'd think that that war would have taught us a lesson," declares one Pentagon colonel, "but we're in just as sorry shape for backup equipment now as we were then."

Ammunition is also short. Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, charges that "every bullet and shell fired by the Army in a Middle East war" would be at the expense of drawing down "our dangerously inadequate stocks marked for Europe." And some of the more complex ammo, such as antitank rounds, requires high-alloy steel and sophisticated production machinery—both long lead-time items. "If there is a sudden increase in demand," says Edward J. McElliott, vice-president of Chamberlain Mfg. Corp., "there could be a serious crunch."

Whether the new Administration program will solve such problems is open to doubt. The President is sending to Congress a defense budget request calling for \$157.5 billion of appropriations—a real increase, assuming a 7.5 percent inflation rate, of 5 percent over the level of the current fiscal year. That rate of increase is to be maintained through 1985, by which time annual appropriations will have reached \$250 billion—and actual outlays, \$230 billion—assuming an average annual inflation rate of 6.7 percent.

The question is whether the money targeted for hardware can actually be spent. A backlog of Defense appropriations—funds committed to defense projects but not yet spent—has been piling up in the U.S. Treasury in recent years (page 84). The backlog, mostly procurement dollars, now totals more than \$80 billion.

Yet many U.S. defense analysts are convinced that Carter's budget projections are far too low. A recent report prepared for the American Enterprise Institute predicts, in an extreme example, that the U.S. defense budget will have to rise to \$1 trillion annually by 1985—four times what the Administration now plans—to "simply hold its own" in the renewed arms race with the Russians.

Underlying this premise is the presumed need not only for stepped-up production of tactical weapons but also for a whole array of new strategic offensive and defensive systems, especially now that the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) seems to be stillborn. Such systems might include

such exotic weapons as a costly high-energy laser stationed in space to knock down intercontinental ballistic missiles. A better bet, perhaps, is the B-1 bomber, designed by Rockwell International Corp., which Carter axed in 1977.

The B-1, however, typifies the mixed picture of industrial preparedness. Rockwell has kept its production tooling for the plane, and it claims that it could obtain the needed labor. But Bastian "Buz" Hello, president of Rockwell's Aircraft Group, admits that the company might not be able to get enough supplies in what he calls a "savage" materials market. And one subcontractor executive notes: "In retrospect, we're very lucky the B-1 wasn't authorized by the President. If it had been . . . that would have been the straw that broke the camel's back." Another such straw could be the 50 to 100 giant new CX military transports that the Administration wants to order over the next few years at a total cost of about \$6 billion. These would carry the combat units and equipment of the proposed rapid-deployment force. Roy A. Anderson, chairman of Lockheed Corp., hopes that a modernized version of his company's C-5 transport will be chosen as the CX. But he concedes that he might have to build satellite plants around the country to tap fresh manpower sources.

PRODUCTION ROADBLOCKS

As for existing production programs, one possible candidate for a stepup is the Navy's F-14 fleet-defense interceptor, built by Grumman Corp. The Soviets have built up a formidable arsenal of cruise missiles that they can launch against the U.S. fleet from submarines, bombers, and surface ships, and the F-14s, with their long-range Phoenix missiles, are spread thinly. "We could be faced with a high attrition rate of F-14s and not much backup," grimly notes a Pentagon official. Meanwhile, the plane's production rate, trimmed by previous defense budget constraints, is minuscule—about 2½ a month. George M. Skurla, president of Grumman Aerospace Corp., sees no possibility of a sustained surge on his lines, noting, "There's more work than we have people or materials to handle."

The F-14 illustrates another key catch-up problem for the U.S.—the sophistication of its weapons. The Navy originally planned to buy more than 700 F-14s at about \$12 million apiece, but cut the order to 429 when the price rose to \$25 million a copy. "There has been a tendency to buy increasingly complex systems in smaller quantities—a willingness to pay four to five times as much money to get an increment of capability," asserts Philip C. Norwine, Bell Helicopter Textron's vice-president for U.S. government marketing. That stretches development times and delays production.

Now there is a growing belief in the Pentagon and in industry that the U.S. must pull back from high technology. The nation must move, says Norwine, more toward "the Russian philosophy of adequate quality in sufficient quantity." That could speed up new systems, but "sufficient quantity," it appears, will be hard to come by and will take time.

Another weapon system that will be sparse in numbers in the event of a near-term conflict is the A-10 aircraft, built by Fairchild Republic Co. The Air Force's Slay describes the A-10, with its thunderous 30-mm rapid-fire, antitank gun and arsenal of bombs and missiles, as "very important for close air support of ground troops, especially in the beginning stages of combat." The Air Force has acquired 300 of the planes and wants to accelerate their 12-a-month production rate to a planned buy of 733. But Thomas R. Tuohy, vice-president and direc-

tor of administration and material for Fairchild, says, "We're at our peak right now." He explains that he could double the capacity of his Long Island plant in six months, "but it wouldn't do us any good—we can't get materials."

One of Tuohy's key problems is forgings. The big forgings that make up the A-10's main frame, for example, have to be ordered 114 weeks in advance from Wyman-Gordon, one of only three forging companies with presses big enough to do the job. "We can't handle any additional demand, no matter where it comes from," says Wyman-Gordon's Carter.

And forgings, of course, are a problem not only for the primes but for many of the other subcontractors who supply the primes. Parker Hannifin Corp., which makes the main flight controls for the Air Force's F-16 fighter and the Navy's F-18 fighter, has to order its forgings 60 to 80 weeks ahead. And that pushes the company's total lead time to deliver systems to General Dynamics, McDonnell Douglas, and Northrop to two years or more.

A squeeze on critical materials is also troublesome to primes and subcontractors alike. The titanium armor for the A-10, for example, must be ordered 92 weeks ahead. Even more urgent, though, is the threatened shortage of cobalt and chromium. These are key ingredients of the engines that power both military and commercial aircraft. They will also be used in the engine, made by Avco Corp., that will power the new XM-1 tank to be built by Chrysler Corp., scheduled to start in production this year, and James R. Kerr, Avco's chairman and CEO, is worried about getting hold of castings that use such alloys.

STOCKPILE TROUBLES

The U.S. gets most of its cobalt from Zaire, which cut off its exports in 1978 during internal strife largely fomented by the Soviets. Now the U.S. is developing a cobalt mine in Idaho, but it will produce only 3 million to 5 million lb. a year—only 20 percent of current annual consumption. It is possible to substitute for cobalt, but chromium still is indispensable. Most chromium comes from Russia, Rhodesia, and South Africa. While South Africa is the most reliable source, even that source could be cut off in time of war.

The U.S. stockpile of strategic materials, it appears, may not be much help. It is badly in arrears in cobalt, some types of chromium, and titanium; it is also short of its goals in such other essential materials as the platinum-group metals, which include iridium and palladium. Moreover, the quality of some of the metal in the stockpile is highly questionable. "If you look at what's in the stockpile," says William L. Swager, head of materials research at Battelle Memorial Institute's Columbus Laboratories, "we're really in trouble."

Almost as basic as the materials lag is the manpower lag. In a recent survey by the National Machine Tool Builders' Assn., an important component of the defense business, 70 percent of its members reported worrisome shortages of technical workers. Says the association's president, James A. Gray: "We're facing one of the greatest skill shortages in the history of this country."

While chronic everywhere, manpower pains are particularly acute in California. A big part of the problem, say many aerospace executives, is Boeing's aggressive courting of engineers and technicians. But Boeing is not the only contractor to benefit from an epidemic of job-hopping. Forced to abide strictly by Washington wage guidelines if they wish to continue doing government business, defense contractors cannot issue fat raises. "That means," says Avco's Kerr,

"that the engineer can better himself and take a quantum jump in salary by going to work for someone else—and our engineers are doing just that."

Avco has its headquarters in New England, and Kerr claims that some of the engineers he has lost to West Coast aerospace companies got salary boosts of 35 percent to 40 percent. But some defectors are moving right out of the industry into such high-paying businesses as oil drilling and electronic toys. James H. MacDonald, corporate vice-president for personnel at McDonnell Douglas Corp., says that his company has had to revamp its recruiting programs "to personalize what we're doing." And it is intensifying its efforts to lure employees from other companies through such tactics as radio and newspaper advertising.

Some industry sources think that the engineering manpower problem—a reversal of the glut of the early 1970s—will ease once again as more engineering students, now enrolled in colleges, become available for hire. But the answer to the problem of the missing—or recalcitrant—subcontractors may not be so straightforward. Many companies once bid eagerly on defense contracts. They built up their resources to handle them but then suffered in the aerospace slump of the early 1970s, and they have just disappeared. And others steadfastly refuse to expand. They are concerned, explains Patrick S. Parker, chairman of Parker Hannifin, "about having to go out and make capital expenditures to take care of peaking government demand and then having government say 'thanks' and walk away."

BLOWING HOT AND COLD

One company that got burned is Blaw Knox Foundry & Mill Machinery Inc., the sole producer of turret and hull castings for the M-60 tank in its East Chicago plant. In the mid-1970s the Army pushed the company to open a second foundry in Wheeling, W. Va., so that it could replace the tanks shipped to Israel in the Yom Kippur war. Now, M-60 production has been cut back to make room in the budget for the XM-1, and XM-1 does not need the heavy castings. That irritates Blaw Knox President Charles F. Hauck, who notes that his company "pushed hard" and spent heavily to increase and maintain its M-60 production. Blaw Knox has now converted the Wheeling foundry to commercial production at a cost of more than \$8 million.

Subcontractors also complain about low profits, naive procurement officers, and heavy paperwork. Defense work "is not the most profitable business to be in," says James H. Springle, vice-president and general manager of control systems operations at the Cadillac Gage Div. of Ex-Cell-O Corp., which supplies turret components for the M-60 tank.

Thomas V. Jones, chairman of Northrop Corp., thinks he knows what changes would have to be made to entice companies back into the defense business. Of key importance would be multiyear procurement budgeting so that contractors could plan intelligently their own capital and manpower investments. Also needed, he says, is tax reform aimed at allowing more liberal write-offs of capital investment. With such changes, he believes, new machine tools, forging presses, and other capital equipment would become available for defense needs.

Such changes, though, would take time to be made and to become effective. Some of the large machine tools used by the aerospace industry, for example, take two years to build. "It just isn't within the capability of the industry to build them within 12 months," says Clifford R. Meyer, group vice-president at Cincinnati Milacron Inc., the nation's largest machine tool builder.

PRIORITIES AND SENSITIVITY

With overnight expansion of the industry out of the question, then, there is a growing consensus that a substantial surge in defense production can occur only if there is a political decision, within the White House, that a state of emergency exists. In that event, much of the subcontractors' efforts on behalf of the commercial aircraft builders, in particular, would be diverted temporarily to meet defense demands. In a quick-response situation, says Raymond C. Tower, president of FMC Corp., which builds armored personnel carriers and other military vehicles, "the government would have to place procurement priorities on some materials."

Grumman's Skurla believes that the Administration may be ready to face up to such moves. It now realizes, he says, "how far the defense capability of the U.S. has deteriorated as a result of subcontractor defections, and it knows that the only way it probably can repair the situation short-term is to get the White House to set priorities on where the national interests lie."

But Pentagon procurement officials tread gingerly around this topic. They point out that most major weapon systems are automatically given production priority ratings, called DO ratings, under the Defense Production Act of 1950. A certain amount of reallocation goes on "all the time," says one.

A recent example occurred after five-month strikes at Fafnir Bearing Co. and Ladish Co., which make bearings and forgings, respectively, for the Pratt & Whitney engines used on the F-15 and F-16 fighters. Faced with severe engine shortages, the Air Force's Slay sent teams to the Pratt & Whitney Div. of United Technologies Corp., which also makes engines for commercial aircraft, and to the two suppliers to remind them that they were duty-bound to put defense orders ahead of commercial orders. The two subcontractors are now supplying Pratt & Whitney with bearings and castings that had been intended for Boeing and other commercial aircraft builders. But, notes Slay, "I had to go to the mat with Boeing on it."

Even so, McDonnell Douglas will be building some F-15s without engines through mid-1981. As yet, the government has not slapped the engine contractor and its subcontractors with the toughest rating, a priority known as DX. This requires the President's signature and is seldom applied. For security, the Defense Dept. will not say which systems have merited its application, but, says one Pentagon source, "you can bet that the cruise missile has it."

In any event, says Church, the Pentagon's procurement boss, "our priority system hasn't accomplished what it can accomplish if we really crack down." Church notes that "in many cases, the contractors don't respond to it, don't pass it on to their subcontractors, or don't police it if they do." The main reason, he believes, is the attractions of the burgeoning commercial aircraft market and the fact that "the country hasn't been faced with a war-type scenario." If the nation were on a wartime footing, Church says, "I believe all the contractors would follow the flag."

However, even if fully observed, the system of defense priorities is no panacea. "If we were to put top priority on the production of every major weapon we might need," says a high-level Pentagon official, "we would risk creating the same problem inside the defense family that now exists between defense and commercial contractors. And another defense planner notes that "if we push civilian production around too much, we may wind up shooting ourselves in

the foot." He points out, for example, that it is important to maintain good, reliable communications and transportation in the private sector during a national emergency.

How to strike a proper balance is among the questions being addressed in a current study by the National Security Council and the Defense Department. That study is also addressing the specific problem of the nation's forging capacity. One proposal is that the government build another large forging press on the order of—or even larger than—the 50,000-ton machine now operated by Aluminum Co. of America in Cleveland. An alternative would be to start ordering military forgings from European suppliers. However, that supply line would be long and, in wartime, vulnerable. And those forges are already beginning to fill up with orders from the growing aircraft industry on the Continent and from Boeing.

Some clues as to what the White House and Pentagon officials may recommend as a result of their study—scheduled for completion "very soon," says one—may lie in a 1976 report by the Defense Science Board. Richard D. DeLauer, executive vice-president of TRW Inc., who headed up the DSB study, notes that it concluded that the defense industry would need two years to boost its output dramatically. He feels that that lead time still holds, despite the intervening rush of commercial business. The industry's first move in such a mobilization, the DSB study suggested, should be to extend its work week and ultimately to go to double shifts.

Such measures may help. But they still do not address the perhaps deadly shortage of weapons components and subsystems the U.S. would face if war were to come soon. "The lead-time problem has caught us short," declares the Air Force's Slay. "There is no magic way to get more airplanes in a hurry. And if we wait until the balloon goes up to decide to surge our defense production, we will be in deep, deep trouble."

OTA REPORT ON ADVANCED GROUP RAPID TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, unless the cities of this country adopt forms of transportation that consume less energy and space, traffic congestion will probably double between 1975 and 2000.

One technology now under development that could help meet cities' future transit needs is automated guideway transit (AGT), driverless transit vehicles operating on their own fixed guideways. With further development, AGT could offer better service in some cities at less cost than current rail systems. This is one of the major findings of a study by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) which evaluates the need for continued development of third generation AGT technology, called advanced group rapid transit (AGRT).

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration's (UMTA) current plan calls for reduced funding for magnetic levitation, one of three prototype sys-

tems under development. OTA finds, however, that it is too early in the development cycle to predict which one will prove superior for most uses.

Therefore, OTA concludes, "there is no sound technical basis for discontinuing work or providing any promising technology with significantly less funding."

Performed at the request of the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, the OTA study—called Impact of Advanced Group Rapid Transit Technology—assesses recently proposed changes in the scope and cost of the AGRT program, which is currently funded by UMTA.

In assessing the role that AGRT could play in meeting cities' future transit needs, the OTA report examines the economic as well as the technological aspects of AGRT development and adoption, and outlines the basic policy options for continued R. & D. in AGRT.

Supplies of the summary of the report are available as a separate, self-mailer for Members to send to constituents and interested local agencies—call 224-8996.

For the information of my colleagues, I attach a brief summary of the OTA report called Impact of Advanced Group Rapid Transit Technology.

IMPACT OF ADVANCED GROUP RAPID TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY

Driverless transit vehicles operating on exclusive guideways, known as automated guideway transit (AGT), could with further development offer better service at less cost than current rail and trolley systems. This is among the major findings of an OTA study which evaluates the need for continued development of third-generation AGT technology, called advanced group rapid transit (AGRT), now funded by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

First- and second-generation AGT systems are currently operating in airports, universities, hospital complexes, amusement parks, and shopping centers. Third-generation AGRT systems are being developed with vehicles that carry 12 passengers from origin to destination without transfers at speeds of up to 40 mph.

Users and nonusers alike are critical of the lack of amenities, infrequent service, unreliability, crowding, and inconvenience characteristic of transit services currently available in most cities. Technological innovations that may result from the AGRT program could help to address these problems by making transit more attractive through improved trip time, convenience, comfort, flexibility, and frequency of service. The public desires the further advances that AGT should be able to provide.

In the 1980's, cities will face increasing pressure to adopt more space- and fuel-efficient transit systems to meet the challenge of petroleum shortages, urban sprawl, and growing congestion. Barring major policy and lifestyle changes, traffic congestion in cities is expected to double by the year 2000. Automated systems are widely regarded as promising new options for addressing these problems in certain urban areas.

It is too early in the development cycle, however, to predict which of several technologies currently being pursued will prove superior for most uses. The selection of a

single-system concept would appear premature at this time.

Cost comparisons with existing urban rail technology look favorable, but will require validation in a real-world installation. Questions requiring further study include: reliability of new technology; community acceptance of elevated guideway designs; emergency evacuation from narrow elevated guideways; operating problems in ice and snow; and public attitudes toward sharing small, automated vehicles with strangers.

There is no guarantee that these systems will be marketed, even if the R&D goals are met. Industry is finding it increasingly difficult to justify production of any transit technology, given a history of uncertain Federal support, unrealistic development timetables, complex institutional barriers, and the lack of established, stable markets. In West Germany and Japan, a cooperative relationship between government and industry exists which has helped ensure an orderly program of long-range transit innovation and healthy transit equipment manufacturers. A closer examination of foreign government/industry relations is warranted.

While development of advanced AGT systems offers the prospect of improved transit services, urban transportation problems do not lend themselves to a single, all-encompassing solution. Other near- and long-term options which deserve consideration include expanded use of carpools and vanpools, transportation system management techniques, land use policies, and upgrading existing bus and rail technology. ●

MORAL DILEMMAS IN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late about moral dilemmas in our foreign policy. As we fitfully turn from a misguided policy of so-called détente, to something more rational in its recognition of the sinister nature of Soviet imperial power, the comments of Irving Kristol on "Moral Dilemmas in Foreign Policy," can be helpful. Reprinted below is Mr. Kristol's article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on February 28:

MORAL DILEMMAS IN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Irving Kristol)

It was George Orwell who once said: "We have now sunk to a depth at which the re-statement of the obvious is the first duty of intelligent men." This, it seems to me, is our situation with respect to the "moral dilemmas" of American foreign policy today—except that any such re-statement of the obvious is likely to be regarded as unthinkable by most of our intelligent men.

Take the case of the Shah, whose "crimes" will soon be exposed by an ad hoc international commission, established with our approval. The rank hypocrisy of such an exercise in political theater is instantly nauseating—two of the nations represented on that commission (Syria and Algeria) have records on human rights far more illiberal than the Shah's. Moreover, we know beforehand exactly what the findings of this commission will have to be. They will be to the effect that the Shah restricted political rights, imprisoned or exiled his opponents, appropriated a portion of the na-

tion's income for his family's personal use, permitted (or ordered) his secret police to torture some hundreds of his opponents, etc.

CERTAIN POINTS OMITTED

We also know beforehand what such a commission will not say. It will not point out that all of these wickednesses of the Shah have also characterized every government the Iranian people have known since time immemorial, and usually to a greater degree. Nor will it point out that the Shah instituted a land reform in which vast areas belonging to the crown and clergy were distributed to the peasantry. (It was, incidentally, this land reform which brought him the hatred of all those ayatollahs.) Or that he strove energetically, and with considerable success, to use Iran's wealth from oil to modernize the Iranian economy. Or that he tried to modernize the Islamic culture of Iran, giving women greater individual freedom and the universities greater academic freedom than they had ever possessed. Or that during his reign, foreign periodicals, scholars, and journalists were free to circulate in Iran to a degree not known before, or since. Or that his regime actually sent to Europe and America, on government subsidy, more than one hundred thousand college students, to acquire skills and knowledge essential to the modernization of their country. Or that, on the whole, his despotism compared quite favorably with the despotism that now prevails in such other countries as Algeria, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, or our latest ally, Pakistan.

Even to suggest that such discriminating judgments, however valid, are appropriate in the case of the Shah is bound to make us feel uncomfortable and to invite opprobrium. Is it not a betrayal of the democratic idea to imply that some dictatorships are better than others—that some dictatorships may claim a degree of political legitimacy that even liberal democrats ought to respect? We really do not know how to cope with such a question. Our common sense tells us that it would be more than a little absurd—and in any case highly impractical—to declare that all of the world's undemocratic regimes are equally anathema to us. That would be like saying that we Americans are just too good for this world, so that any foreign policy would represent an expense of spirit in a waste of shame. On the other hand, how do we go about making the necessary distinctions between non-liberal and undemocratic regimes with which we might, in relatively good conscience, have amicable relations, and others which, at best, might be allies of convenience but nothing more?

Interestingly enough, prior to World War I the way in which this question should be answered was quite obvious. That answer was provided by the traditions of liberal constitutionalism. To the degree that any authoritarian regime was "enlightened"—i.e., to the degree that it could be judged to be creating economic, political, and cultural preconditions for possible self-government by the people—it was worthy of cautious respect. If it displayed no such "enlightened" intentions, it was "benighted."

The disappearance from our thinking of these old-fashioned categories has created an intellectual vacuum. As a result, we simply cannot bring ourselves to say—or even think—what is clear to any candid observer of the world scene: that there are significant differences among regimes loosely classified as "authoritarian," and that in many countries, where a liberal constitutional regime can only be a more or less distant ideal, politics necessarily revolves around a choice of authoritarian rule. Moreover, it is a real choice. Some authoritarian

governments exhibit at least a half-way respect for the rule of law, others do not. Some govern in a way that is respectful of any potential for eventual self-government, others are petty, personal, narrow-visioned, indifferent to the nation's future. (Somoza in Nicaragua exemplified this latter type.)

And there are still others, increasing in number, who are hostile in principle to the very idea of liberal constitutionalism—the Communist regimes are of this type, and so, of course, is the present "Islamic-Marxist" regime in Iran. These latter, indeed, ought not to be classified as "authoritarian" at all, but can fairly be described as "totalitarian," since they represent a principled antithesis to constitutional democracy.

It is the fundamental fallacy of American foreign policy to believe, in face of the evidence, that all peoples, everywhere, are immediately "entitled" to a liberal constitutional government—and a thoroughly democratic one at that. It is because of this assumption that our discussions of foreign policy, along with our policy itself, are constantly being tormented by "moral dilemmas," as we find ourselves allied to non-liberal and non-democratic regimes. These dilemmas are guilt-inducing mechanisms which cripple policy—an attitude that no nation can sustain for long—or else we take flight into sweeping crusades for "human rights," which quickly brings us up short before intractable realities.

Now, there is nothing inevitable about this state of affairs. As a matter of fact, it is only since World War I—a war fought under the Wilsonian slogans of "self-determination for all nations" and "make the world safe for democracy"—that American foreign policy began to disregard the obvious for the sake of the quixotic pursuit of impossible ideals. Before World War I, intelligent men took it for granted that not all peoples, everywhere, at all times, could be expected to replicate a Western constitutional democracy. This was a point of view, incidentally, shared more or less equally by conservatives, liberals, and socialists.

It was only with World War I and its aftermath that thinking about foreign policy lost its moorings in the real world and became utterly ideologized. For socialists, this transition was accomplished by the transformation of liberal-democratic socialism into totalitarian communism, a form of government that, while relying on sophisticated modes of coercion, is yet so primitive in its political substance—so tribal, one might say—that it is in truth a possibility for all nations, at all times. It is a possibility, of course, purchased at the cost of the liberal, the democratic, and the socialist ideals themselves, but the prospect of immediate power has persuaded socialists throughout the world that this is a profitable trade-off.

For Americans, the transition occurred via the utopian enthusiasm of Woodrow Wilson, preaching "self-determination," "human rights," "one man, one vote," "a world without war" as if these were in fact unproblematic possibilities. The consequence has been a foreign policy that is intellectually disarmed before all those cases where a government is neither totalitarian nor democratic, but authoritarian in one way or another, to one degree or another. We could, if we were sensible, calmly accept this basic reality of world politics, while using our influence to edge unenlightened despotisms toward more enlightened behavior, or enlightened despotisms toward more liberal and humane behavior. Instead, we end up in either an unstable, guilt-ridden and seemingly "immoral" alliance with them or displaying a haughty censoriousness that helps "destabilize" them.

MANDATE OF HEAVEN

Such instability and such diplomatic "destabilization" offers the totalitarian opponents of these authoritarian regimes wonderful opportunities, which they are quick to take advantage of. And, as our illusions, along with our waverings of purpose, breed defeat after defeat, we come to believe that it is, after all, totalitarianism that today has the Mandate of Heaven, or at least the Mandate of History. We come to believe—what is fast becoming an article of liberal faith—that totalitarianism, which effectively represses dissent, is actually a more legitimate form of government than the older types of authoritarianism, which repress dissent less effectively, and that it is positively immoral to support the latter as against the former. Note with what good conscience we embraced Mao's China as an ally, while uneasily chastising the government of Taiwan for violations of political liberties.

The abstract slogans of the Cold War, which President Carter and others are in the process of refurbishing, are an improvement over the abstract slogans of "detente" and "swords into ploughshares," since they at least take account of the totalitarian reality. But this will not help our situation all that much. For it is not a question of our mouthing the wrong abstract slogans but of trying to base a foreign policy on abstract slogans in the first place. The world is heterogeneous and complex—and until we learn to cope with this complexity, and rid ourselves of a guilt complex engendered by our refusal to confront this very complexity, we shall never have a foreign policy worthy of the name.●

VOLUNTEER ARMY LABELED A GRIM JOKE

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, to hear the civilian leaders at the Department of Defense talk, our fellow Americans would never be aware of the very serious problems we are facing in the All-Volunteer Army. However, a recent article in the Washington Post pinpointed some of the more serious deficiencies that have been glossed over for far too long. I urge my colleagues to read the following article by Fred Reed. I am sure they will find it informative and also alarming:

THIS IS THE ARMY?

(By Fred Reed)

I see that Clifford Alexander, secretary of the Army, is treading the long grey road toward new and better Afghanistans. More precisely, he asserts that the Volunteer Army works well. Alexander, a political appointee, is playing the game of let's-pretend that got us into our present dangerous position—saying what suits the political needs of the administration rather than what suits the military needs of the Army.

I have seen the Volunteer Army; for several years I have written for the magazine of the Army Times papers—an odd occupation for a Washington reporter, requiring one to spend time with troops in the field. I suggest to Alexander that the All-Vol is a grim joke.

Last summer I followed an infantry outfit from an average division through jungle

training in the Canal Zone. The level of intelligence was far lower than it was when I was a Marine in 1967. I saw radio operators who could barely operate their radios, men who couldn't read, soldiers who couldn't comprehend a simple lecture on jungle survival. The Pentagon says that the percentage of high school graduates is high. Perhaps it is, given the quality of the schools. Nonetheless, those troops were on the average, very slow. Almost as bad, they lack the leavening of conscripted intelligence to run complicated weaponry.

Further, racial antagonism is serious. Because it is desperate for manpower, the Army recruits anybody it can get: white country kids who don't much like blacks, black street kids who don't like whites at all, Chicanos who aren't enthusiastic about either. Tight discipline can hold such an explosive mix together, but discipline isn't the All-Vol's strong suit.

An instructor in the jungle echoed what I've heard throughout the military: "You can't discipline the blacks because they yell racism, and the officers are scared of being called racists so they won't back you up. If you can't discipline the blacks, you can't discipline the whites. That's where we are. It ought to be equal discipline for everybody, but it isn't. It's no discipline for anybody."

The best men leave. They leave because they are military men and the Army isn't very military now. The problem is serious: folklore to the contrary, brains and leadership are critical in the middle enlisted ranks.

The instructors at the jungle operations school, among the best NCOs I've met, were openly contemptuous of the Volunteer Army. To quote one, "I'm getting out. There's nothing in the Army for me anymore. That's a real problem for the Army. The best NCOs are getting out, and the ones coming up aren't any good. The Army runs on its NCOs. Someday it's going to need them, and they won't be there."

Further, the Volunteer Army has miserable equipment. At Fort Hood, I rode tanks so old and beaten-up that despite heroic maintenance they barely worked. Only one tank in the company had a functioning heater. We spent 11 hours in those steel boxes, in 28° weather and a sleet storm—a lousy, unhealthy, morale-breaking day. An Army that can't provide its troops with a kerosene heater is in trouble.

In Panama, soldiers used antique radios that worked when the mood struck them, or when their operators kicked them. The Special Forces scuba team at Fort Gulick used outmoded double-hose regulators because of a lack of money. A good single-hose regulator costs \$100.

Training costs money, and the Army doesn't have money, so the Army doesn't train—not as it should. The Army can't afford many helicopter hours, so the troops can't practice helicopter operations. Using armored personnel carriers costs money, so the Army doesn't use them often enough. Tanks cost a lot to run, so they spend a lot of time in the barn. Ammunition costs money, so tank gunners don't do much live firing. Any faint hope of survival against overwhelmingly superior Soviet forces will require superior gunnery. No practice, no superiority.

I recommend to Secretary Alexander the following, from a very savvy sergeant (who, incidentally, is getting out): "It's like a percentage. You can improve a lot of mistakes when the crunch comes, but not all of them. The Army's got more mistakes than it's going to be able to correct in a hurry. I'm glad I'm not going to be in combat with what we got now."●

A SOLUTION TO INFLATION?

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, national attention has once again been refocused on the spiraling inflation rate. The Labor Department and Council on Wage and Price Stability reports last week citing an 18 percent annual rate of inflation in January have prompted a truly national outcry on the horrendous ineffectiveness of current economic policies. In what may be seen as a knee-jerk reaction, the Federal Reserve Board immediately moved to increase interest rates—without even waiting for the end of the business day. Editorial pages are full of commentaries on what to do. There is renewed talk about imposition of wage and price controls as the answer to our economic woes.

Wage and price controls are not and never have been the answer to solving the inflation problem. What they are is a misplaced, stopgap attempt to artificially hold the lid on increases. They do nothing to increase productivity which is the heart of the problem. They do nothing to encourage growth, increase capital formation, or promote savings and investment, for they negate the very incentive necessary for economic expansion.

What wage and price controls do, however, is redirect our economic attention away from the marketplace where growth should take place, and focus it on an expensive regulatory structure charged with keeping the lid on tight. As such, wage and price controls divert attention from the real causes of inflation, which include runaway Federal deficit spending and tax rates which pull more and more cheaper and cheaper dollars out of circulation in the marketplace. Controls are merely a band-aid attempt to coverup what has put us in the situation we are in and they must not be viewed as anything more than that.

History, from the time of Hammurabi and ancient Egypt 4,000 years ago, tells of no instance where price controls have worked to stop inflation. If there are those who cannot remember back over 40 centuries, recall the inflationary burst when our most recent experience with controls ended in 1972. The 2 years following lifting of the controls brought recession coupled with an inflation rate of 12.2 percent in 1974—then the highest rate of inflation since 1947. Considering where the rate is today, our previous experience with controls is not an act I think we should follow.

What we need to do and do now is move toward a balanced Federal budget and eliminate the runaway Federal deficit spending that the current administration continues to call for. Federal spending should not grow faster than the gross national product.

And we should move to index Federal tax rates to prevent the Federal Government from reaping a tax windfall because of the very inflation it causes. The most direct answer to inflation is putting the Federal Government on a strict spending diet, and I intend to continue the fight against inflation on this front.●

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1980

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Emergency Unemployment Act of 1980. The purpose of this bill is to provide a program of emergency unemployment compensation for areas experiencing high rates of unemployment.

Over the last several years unemployment has hovered around 5.5 percent. While this rate is still undesirable, unemployment has not been considered a national problem. However, there have been areas where the unemployment rates have been extremely high due to closing of steel plants or layoffs within the auto industry. An example of one such area is Anderson, Ind., which has an unemployment rate of 15.2 percent due to layoffs at General Motors.

Excessively high unemployment rates can, and do, cause tremendous problems for individuals and communities both. Certainly if the national rate of unemployment were anywhere near 15 percent, the need for special unemployment benefits would be obvious. Unfortunately, since extremely high unemployment rates are presently limited to localized areas, the administration and the Congress have been unwilling to address the problem.

We are all familiar with the hardships unemployment can cause those affected, particularly in areas of high unemployment. The people in Anderson, and similar cities, are running out of unemployment benefits and the prospect of finding new work in the near future is dim. We must develop an emergency unemployment program to address their needs.

The only manner we can address the problem of localized high unemployment is on a city-by-city basis; not on a State-by-State basis or a national basis. The Emergency Unemployment Act of 1980 does just that. The bill extends unemployment benefits for an additional 26 weeks for those areas where unemployment has been in excess of 10 percent for a period of at least 4 weeks. There are approximately 10 cities which would qualify.

Although States which experience high unemployment qualify for extended unemployment benefits, that program does not solve the problems of localized unemployment. The Emer-

gency Unemployment Act of 1980 is needed. I strongly urge its passage. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 6690

A bill to provide a program of emergency unemployment compensation for areas experiencing high rates of unemployment

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1980".

FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS

Sec. 2. (a) Any State, the State unemployment compensation law of which is approved by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which desires to do so, may enter into and participate in an agreement with the Secretary under this Act, if such State law contains (as of the date such agreement is entered into) a requirement that extended compensation be payable thereunder as provided by the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970. Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing thirty days' written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) Any such agreement shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency compensation—

(1) to individuals who—

(A) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law;

(B) have no rights to compensation (including both regular compensation and extended compensation) with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law; and

(C) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada,

(2) for any week of unemployment which begins in—

(A) an emergency benefit period (as defined in subsection (c)(2)), and

(B) the individual's period of eligibility (as defined in section 5(a)(2));

except that no payment of emergency compensation shall be made to any individual for any week of unemployment which begins more than two years after the end of the benefit year for which he exhausted his rights to regular compensation.

(c)(1) For purposes of subsection (b)(1)(A), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted his rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(A) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to him based on employment or wages during his base period; or

(B) his rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(2)(A)(i) For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(A), in the case of any area of a State, an emergency benefit period—

(I) shall begin with the third week after a week for which there is an area "emergency on" indicator; and

(II) shall end with the third week after the first week for which there is an area "emergency off" indicator.

(ii) In the case of any area of a State, no emergency benefit period shall last for a period of less than 26 consecutive weeks.

(iii) When a determination has been made

that an emergency benefit period is beginning or ending with respect to any area of a State, the Secretary shall cause notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register.

(B)(i) For purposes of subparagraph (A), there is an area "emergency on" indicator for a week if the rate of insured unemployment in such area for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding three weeks equaled or exceeded 10 per centum.

(ii) For purposes of subparagraph (A), there is an area "emergency off" indicator for a week if the rate of insured unemployment in such area for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding three weeks is less than 10 per centum.

(d) For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of the emergency compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to him during his benefit year under the State law; and

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall (except where inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act) apply to claims for emergency compensation and the payment thereof.

(e)(1) Any agreement under this Act with a State shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency compensation, an emergency compensation account with respect to such individual's benefit year.

(2) The amount established in such account for any individual shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 100 per centum of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to him with respect to the benefit year (as determined under the State law) on the basis of which he most recently received regular compensation; or

(B) 26 times his average weekly benefit amount (as determined for purposes of section 202(b)(1)(C) of the Federal State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970) for his benefit year.

(f) No emergency compensation shall be payable to any individual under an agreement entered into under this Act for any week beginning before whichever of the following is the later:

(1) the week following the week in which such agreement is entered into; or

(2) the first week which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY COMPENSATION

Sec. 3. (a) There shall be paid to each State which has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 per centum of the emergency compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act.

(c) Sums payable to any State by reason of such State's having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount

by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which would have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

FINANCING PROVISIONS

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 5. (a) For purposes of this Act—

(1) the terms "compensation", "regular compensation", "extended compensation", "base period", "benefit year", "State", "State agency", "State law", and "week" shall have the meanings assigned to them under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(2) the term "period of eligibility" means, in the case of any individual, the weeks in his benefit year which begin in an emergency benefit period and, if his benefit year ends within such emergency benefit period, any weeks thereafter which begin in such emergency benefit period;

(3) the term "area" means, with respect to any State—

(A) a labor market area or part of a labor market area which is located within such State, and

(B) all other parts of such State which are not located within any labor market area;

(4) the term "labor market area" means any area (determined without regard to paragraph (3)) designated by the Secretary as being a contiguous population center with a population of at least 50,000 individuals;

(5) the term "rate of insured unemployment" means the percentage arrived at by dividing—

(A) the average weekly number of individuals who are filing claims for weeks or unemployment with respect to the specified period and whose last employment during their base periods was in the area (as determined on the basis of the reports made by the State agency to the Secretary), by

(B) the average monthly covered employment in the area for the specified period;

(6) the rate of insured unemployment for any four week period shall be determined by reference to the average monthly covered employment in the area under the State law for the first four of the most recent six calendar quarters ending before the close of such period; and

(7) determinations with respect to the rate of insured unemployment in any area of a State shall be made by the State agency in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

For purposes of any State law which refers to an extension under Federal law of the duration of benefits under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, this Act shall be treated as amendatory of such Act.

(b) For purposes of this Act, to the extent

that an emergency benefit period is not in effect in all areas of a State, the determination of an individual's period of eligibility or of whether there is an emergency benefit period applicable to the individual shall be made by reference to the area in which the individual was last employed during the base period for the benefit year with respect to which such individual most recently received regular compensation.

(c)(1) If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(A) shall be ineligible for further emergency compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and

(B) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(2)(A) In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State is authorized to require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(i) the payment of such emergency compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual, and

(ii) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(B) The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the three-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 per centum of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(C) No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(3) Any determination by a State agency under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.●

HOSPITAL COSTS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about hospital cost containment. We all want to curtail the cost of medical expenses. But are they the ones who

have had the most inflation. An interesting comparison was prepared by the Dallas-Fort Worth Hospital Council. They took the cost increases in this country from 1967 through 1977. Cost percent increases are listed below.

Hospital costs, 194.

Legal fees, 220.

Postal fees, 226.

Social security, 300.

HEW budget, 364.

Federal budget, 400.

Cost of running Congress, 442.●

REV. HERB EZELL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1980, the Wilmington Lions Club will present its annual Outstanding Citizen Award to Rev. Herb Ezell for the great contributions he has made by his work as a minister and through his involvement in the community. I would like to share briefly with my colleagues today an account of this man's most noteworthy accomplishments. It will clearly show how this year's choice for this award is a fine one indeed.

Reverend Ezell has been a pastor longer than any other minister in the Wilmington-Carson area. At the Harbor Christian Center in Wilmington he has led a congregation for over 32 years. His role, however, has been more than being strictly a religious and spiritual leader. He has inspired many people into self-improvement by encouraging them to use education as an opportunity for advancement. His words and action have also turned many once-apatetic residents into active and involved citizens.

Within his profession he has assumed leadership roles. He has been a regular member of the Wilmington-Carson Ministerial Association for over 30 years, and has served as its secretary and president. In addition, he has trained over 40 men for the Christian ministry.

Rev. Herb Ezell's religious work has extended far across the Nation and even around the world. He has been featured frequently as a convention speaker in U.S. cities. In Mexico, Israel, Rome, Greece, and Jordan, he has conducted Bible seminars. On one occasion he has had a conference in Mexico City's Presidential Palace with the Lopez-Portillo family. To aid destitute villages in Mexico, he has flown nearly 200,000 miles delivering needed clothing and medical supplies.

Even with such far off interests and involvements, Reverend Ezell has still managed to devote much of his time to community affairs in Wilmington. He has served as chaplain of the Wilmington Coordinating Council, and a member of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce for many years. A cam-

paign to have the city of Los Angeles plant trees on both sides of Wilmington Boulevard was made successful by his dedicated leadership.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Reverend Ezell on the great work he has done as a clergyman and as a citizen. We know Wilmington and the entire harbor community can be proud to have him as one of its own. We send Herb Ezell, his wife, Edna, and their children, sons Harold and Donald, our very best wishes for a happy and prosperous future. ●

MARSHAL TITO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the real experts on Yugoslavia is Mr. David Martin, author of "Patriot or Traitor: The Case of General Mikhailovich." When President Tito succumbs to the physical ailments which beset him at this time, it will be inevitable that he will receive many eulogies and commentaries devoted to his long and historic career. Mr. Martin feels that some criticism is necessary to balance out these well-intended tributes. Therefore, I wish to insert into the RECORD Mr. Martin's commentary:

MARSHAL TITO: SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS TO TEMPER THE INEVITABLE EULOGIES

TITO AND STALIN

In breaking with Stalin in 1948, Tito displayed independence and courage. The break with Moscow involved extremely difficult and costly readjustments for Yugoslavia. Prior to the break, half of Yugoslavia's trade, all of its investment credits, and all the equipment for its Five-Year Plan had depended on the Soviets. The cost of reorienting trade toward the West, cutting back the development program, relocating industries for fear of Soviet attack, fortifying the frontier, and maintaining their army, came to \$3 billion annually.

The question remains, however, how Tito managed to rise to the top of the Yugoslav Communist Party during the Stalin terror of the 1930's when virtually the entire leadership of the Yugoslav Party was wiped out in Moscow. It stands to reason that his survival and advancement could only have been purchased by loyal support of the Stalin regime. It is worth noting, too, that Belgrade during the post-war period functioned as the Cominform headquarters and that Tito, far more than Stalin, provided the political and material support for the Communist insurgency in Greece which was frustrated thanks to a major American and British effort.

THE WORLD WAR II RECORD

After the invasion of the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941—but not before that—Tito's Partisans harassed the Germans and fought many impressive engagements against them. The Partisan accomplishments have been chronicled by many Englishmen and Americans who served with them. These accomplishments have, however, been vastly exaggerated because of the tendency on the part of Tito's British and American supporters to accept at face value all of the claims of the

Partisan propaganda apparatus. In justifying his decision in early 1944 to throw all of Britain's support to Tito, Prime Minister Churchill made the wildly exaggerated statement that Tito had been holding 25 German divisions in Yugoslavia. More recently [New York Times, February 10, 1980] James Reston informed us that Tito's Partisans tied down 14 German divisions in Yugoslavia during World War II. Although the German forces were supported by substantial Bulgarian, Hungarian and Croatian Ustashi units during the Occupation, (and by a large Italian force until the collapse of Italy), the fact is that, once Yugoslavia had been subjugated, the Wehrmacht never maintained more than 7 occupation divisions in Yugoslavia. A substantial portion of this occupation army was stationed in Serbia proper, the largest and most populous of Yugoslavia's provinces and, with its vital north-south communication routes, strategically the most important.

Hand in hand with this tendency to upgrade Tito went the denigration of the Mikhailovich movement. Contrary to the impression that Tito controlled the entire Yugoslav countryside, the countryside of Serbia and of many of the other Serbian-populated areas of Yugoslavia belonged to Mikhailovich. On this point, there was little difference between the estimates of the British mission to Mikhailovich and the German high command. Colonel Bailey, who was in charge of the British mission through most of 1943, repeatedly made the point that Mikhailovich enjoyed overwhelming popular support in Serbia, while the Partisans had only negligible strength there.

On February 9, 1943 General Reinhard Gehlen, head of the German military intelligence for eastern Europe, reported the following in a top-secret memorandum to the German general staff:

"Among the various resistance movements which increasingly cause trouble in the area of the former Yugoslav state, the movement of General Mikhailovich remains in the first place with regard to leadership, armament, organization, and activity. . . . The followers of D.M. come from all classes of the population and at present comprise about 80 percent of the Serbian people. Hoping for the liberation from the 'alien yoke' and for a better new order, and an economical and social new balance, their number is continuously increasing."

Many important actions fought by the Mikhailovich forces during 1943 and 1944 were credited to the Partisans by BBC. This was the subject of numerous protests to Cairo and to BBC by the British mission to Mikhailovich. For example, on November 16, 1943, Brigadier C. D. Armstrong, then Chief of the British mission, fired off this omnibus protest:

"If you want to get the best out of Mikhailovich you must give him fairer press and broadcasts. Bailey was with Mikhailovich forces when (they) took Priboj and Prijepolje and Berane. I saw capture Visegrad, destruction bridges, and know Ostojic took Rogatica. Mikhailovich never credited with any (of) these, although reported to you. On the other hand, when Partisans drove his forces out, Partisans credited on BBC (with capture of these places from enemy)."

At Prijepolje on September 11, at Visegrad on October 5, and at Rogatica on October 14, the Mikhailovich forces had attacked very strong Axis garrisons, in each case killing between 200 and 300 of the enemy. By guerrilla standards, these were among the most important actions fought by the resis-

tance forces anywhere in Europe. At Berane on September 12 the Mikhailovich forces took the surrender of some 6,000 men of the Italian Venezia division and at Priboj on September 12, after a hard night's fighting, they took the surrender of another several thousand Italians.

Tito, Mikhailovich, and the question of collaboration

When Tito executed Mikhailovich in July of 1946, he did so on the charge that the Mikhailovich forces had collaborated with the Axis. In support of this, the Yugoslav prosecutors adduced numerous documents to prove the existence of such collaboration. Some of these documents were unquestionably valid. How much they actually proved was another matter. The fact is that there were also a number of "collaborationists" agreements entered into by the Partisans with the Germans. Walter Roberts has revealed that on March 13, 1943, there took place a meeting between Lieutenant General Benignus Dippold, commander of the German 717th Infantry Division, and three top leaders of the Partisan movement—Milovan Djilas, Dr. Vladimir Velebit, and General Koca Popovic. Roberts summarized this memorandum and several subsequent documents as follows:

"The Partisan delegation stressed that the Partisans saw no reason for fighting the German army—they added that they fought against the Germans only in self defense—but wished solely to fight the Chetniks . . . that they would fight the British should the latter land in Yugoslavia . . . (and that,) inasmuch as they wanted to concentrate on fighting the Chetniks, they wished to suggest respective territories of interest." In a signed document which they left with the Germans, the three Partisan leaders not only proposed further prisoner exchanges and German recognition of the rights of the Partisans as combatants, but also stated that they "regard(ed) the Chetniks as their main enemies," and proposed a cessation of hostilities between Partisans and Germans.

A few days later, Kasche, the German minister in Zagreb, sent a message to Berlin in which he discussed the possibility "that Tito and his supporters will cease to fight against Germany, Italy, and Croatia, and retire to the Sandjak, in order to settle matters with Mikhailovich's Chetniks."

Roberts made the point that this series of negotiations with the Germans apparently commenced in mid-November, 1942. Ribbentrop, in a cable on March 29, 1943, placed a ban on further collaboration or negotiation with the Partisans. In reply to this cable, however, Kasche continued to plead the cause of his arrangement with the Partisans. He told Ribbentrop that in all of the negotiations with the Partisans up until that time, "the reliability of Tito's promises had been confirmed," and he again argued that it would be useful if the Partisans were given a free hand to fight the Chetniks. Ribbentrop, however, refused to be moved and shortly thereafter the German forces launched a major offensive against the Partisans and against the Chetnik forces in Montenegro.

Perhaps the most apt commentary on the general subject of collaboration has been by Yugoslav dissident author Mihailo Mihailov. In an article in the New Leader he observed that, when the Partisans entered into signed accommodations with the Germans, they rationalized their actions by claiming that they were playing tricks on them. But when individual Chetnik commanders signed agreements, this was proof of collaboration.

¹ Quotations are from my book, "Patriot or Traitor: The Case of General Mikhailovich."

TITO AND THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

When Soviet tanks moved back into Budapest on November 4, 1956, Tito initially protested the invasion, and under his instructions, the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest gave asylum to the ousted Hungarian Premier, Imre Nagy. But Tito moved rapidly to accommodate himself to the new situation in Hungary. As Claire Sterling pointed out (*The Reporter*, April 4, 1957): "Of the two threats he saw in Hungary—anti-communism and Soviet military intervention—Tito feared the first one the more. 'The former is a catastrophe,' he said; 'The latter is a mistake.'" Because this was his attitude, Tito moved in a short period of time from criticism to condonation of the Soviet invasion—this, despite the fact that on November 14, 1956 the Russians had kidnapped ex-Premier Nagy as he left the Yugoslav Embassy under an officially agreed safe conduct, and had then put him on trial and executed him.

Tito and "nonalignment"

The perception of Tito's Yugoslavia as a non-aligned nation has given rise to the widespread belief that Tito is truly impartial in the conflict between the superpowers, and that his opposition to U.S. foreign policy interests on certain issues is offset by an equal opposition to Soviet interests on other issues. This view has recently been fortified because Tito came down on the side of the West at the United Nations in voting to condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. There have been other issues, too, on which Tito either supported the Western position or at least failed to support the Soviet position. But looking at his record whole, one has to note his ardent support of the Arab invasion of Israel in 1973; his support of the Soviet-Cuban operations in Angola; his support of the U.N. resolution condemning Zionism as racism; his support of the Cuban inspired resolution calling for the "Decolonization" of Puerto Rico; his bitter opposition to the Camp David accord; his support of the Arab extremists against the Arab moderates; his failure to apprehend Carlos despite the urgings of France and Germany when the world's most wanted terrorist was visiting Belgrade. When the many minuses are stacked up against the several pluses, it is difficult not to agree with former Ambassador Laurence Silberman that "When push comes to shove . . . the Yugoslavs are almost invariably found on the opposite side of every issue on world politics that matters to the United States."

Tito and terrorism

Tito's diplomatic establishments abroad have frequently been the targets of Croatian and Serbian extremists. The existence of such acts of terrorism has repeatedly been called to the attention of the American public. There is no comparable public awareness, however, of the fact that the Tito government in recent years has engaged in a systematic campaign of assassinations of political opponents in Europe and the United States. Over the past decade, the UDBA's assassination squads have taken the lives of some 20 opponents in exile.

The matter of the UDBA's activities in the United States received some attention in a report on foreign intelligence operations in the United States put out in early August of 1979 by the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Summarizing this report, the *Washington Post* of August 9, 1979 said:

"The State Department has actively discouraged FBI investigations of likely crimes committed in the United States by friendly intelligence services. Moreover, the depart-

ment has not expelled known spies using diplomatic cover, despite repeated allegations of misbehavior by those spies.

"The FBI does investigate specific complaints of criminal violations but it makes no systematic effort to ascertain the activities within the United States of 'friendly' foreign intelligence services, according to the report.

"... the report argues persuasively that even when the foreign intelligence agencies have not carried out their more startling plans, the pattern of 'harassment and intimidation' of dissidents has had a 'chilling effect' on public discussion and attitudes in this country toward governments with controversial human rights records at home.

"The intimidation has worked to deprive the targeted emigres, some of whom were naturalized U.S. citizens, of constitutional rights in this country to freedom of speech and assembly that are guaranteed to all U.S. residents.

"A Serbian emigre, Dragisha Kasikovich, was shot to death in Chicago in June, 1977 after the FBI had received information from the CIA indicating he was a potential assassination target of the Yugoslav intelligence service. A 10-year-old girl who reportedly witnessed the murder was also killed. The report said that the FBI had received 'a reliable report' that Yugoslav intelligence officers were involved in the murders. The case is still unsolved."

JOSEPH O. PARKER

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1980, Joseph O. Parker retired as Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission. With the exception of a few months Joe Parker served as Vice Chairman of the Commission from 1971 until June 1978, when he was appointed as Chairman of the Commission by President Carter.

Mr. Parker is often referred to as one of the most distinguished men to have served on the U.S. International Trade Commission. A look at his record certainly supports that view. He came to the Commission from private law practice. Prior to entering the practice of law Mr. Parker served in the Office of Solicitor in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and as General Counsel to the House Committee on Agriculture. In addition to serving on many international committees, particularly with respect to agricultural and food matters, he also served as consultant to the Select Committee on Foreign Aid—better known as the Christian Herter committee—which gave birth to the Marshall plan.

Mr. Parker is a native of Pratt, Kans., and received his AB from the University of Kansas. He received his law degree from Harvard and is admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. He is married to the former Mary Louise Klose.

During Joe Parker's tenure as Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Com-

mission the Congress enacted legislation which significantly increased the Commission's authorities and responsibilities. To support these increased activities the Congress authorized a near doubling of the Commission's staff and a tripling of its annual appropriation during his tenure at the Commission.

The period during which Mr. Parker served as Chairman of the Commission was a period of particular improvement and accomplishment for that body and a highlight of his distinguished career. Under his direction lingering organizational and personnel problems resulting from a prior reorganization were resolved. Highly qualified senior staff members were recruited and hired to carry out the Commission's functions. Near record numbers of investigations were completed and not a single statutory deadline was exceeded. Significantly, the Commission was entirely exempted from the recent reorganization of trade functions in the Federal Government. A large and complex study was completed at the request of the Ways and Means Committee in which each of the agreements negotiated at the multilateral trade negotiations was analyzed and the impact of proposed tariff reductions was examined. Under his direction the Commission signed the first labor contract in its history. His guidance and leadership have certainly left the Commission in a strengthened position to carry out its responsibilities.

Our former colleague, Catherine May Bedell, noted at Mr. Parker's farewell ceremony that:

We have been lucky to have you as our Commissioner and we could use 8½ more years of your guidance, your wisdom and your quiet leadership. But we at the Commission know that what you brought to us and how you used it in helping us build and develop properly at the agency will be a permanent memorial to your service. The quality of your advice and guidance has been reflected in many of our investigations and reports. Your sound thinking on crucial decisions involving our "clients" has won you not only the respect of your fellow Commissioners but the public which we serve.●

DAVID MAYNE ELDER

HON. DOUG BARNARD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a gentleman who for 20 years has exemplified all that is good and admirable in public service.

I refer to my administrative assistant, David Mayne Elder, who has retired this month after two decades on Capitol Hill.

Mayne Elder first came to Washington in 1961 with former Congressman Robert G. Stephens of Georgia. It was my pleasure and good fortune to retain him upon my election, for the service he has rendered to the 10th

District of Georgia has made him a respected friend among my constituency.

Not only is Mayne known by every official, mayor, and county commissioner in my district, but he is an understanding and resourceful liaison for the private citizen seeking help from Washington.

In every respect he has been an exemplary administrative assistant, but especially in his loyalty, integrity, and dedication to the responsibilities of the job. It is because of men and women like Mayne Elder that we Members can better carry out our duties.

I know his many friends on Capitol Hill and in Georgia join me in wishing Mayne the greatest happiness and good wishes on his retirement.

His example will continually remind us of the obligation of duty and the virtue of public service.●

OUR DOWN UNDER FRIENDS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who praises our valued ally and friend Australia.

Prime Minister Fraser is described, along with Britain's Prime Minister Thatcher, as having done—

... more than any other government leaders to support President Carter and alert the free world to the potentially grave danger of the Soviet move into Afghanistan.

Australia provides a vitally important role in the defense of the southern and western Pacific area. I believe it is important to recognize the continuing contribution that nation is making for the freedom and security of the world.

The article follows:

OUR DOWN UNDER FRIENDS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SYDNEY.—This great island continent of fascinating contrasts, warmly hospitable outgoing people, and inestimable strategic importance to the United States was the last stop on our journalistic task force's visit to the South Pacific.

The role Australia plays in helping to defend the United States as well as itself is not, I believe, generally known at home, at least it was not by me before coming here. I will tell you more about it later in this report, but first a little about what is the world's smallest continent and largest island.

History books tell us that Australia was explored in the 17th and 18th centuries by Dutch and English expeditions, especially Captain James Cook, one of the greatest navigators of all time. The first whites to settle the island were convicts sent from England in 1787. Many of them were impoverished men and women imprisoned under cruel conditions for such minor offenses as stealing bread.

In what surely must be one of the most inspiring chapters in the history of mankind, those wretched, woebegone people and their descendants built Australia into one of the most highly civilized and prosperous nations in the world.

What I don't remember reading in my history books is that our own American Revolution was indirectly responsible for the settlement of Australia by those original outcasts of whom England should be proud.

Our victory in the War of Independence meant the American colonies could no longer be used as a dumping ground for the inmates of Britain's overcrowded jails. It was thus necessary to set up a penal colony in some other country.

The eastern coast of Australia was finally chosen and on Jan. 26, 1788, a fleet of 11 ships, after a voyage lasting eight months, landed 760 convict men and women in what the governor of the colony, Captain Arthur Phillip, called "the finest harbor in the world." He named it Sydney after the then British secretary of state for colonies. Today it is a modern city with a harbor bigger than San Francisco and skyscrapers to match New York.

Perhaps the happenstance contribution we made to the founding of Australia may have something to do with the fact that the people of this island country have been so friendly and such staunch allies of America for so many years.

About the size of the United States, Australia is approximately 5,000 miles distant from the California coast. It is the lowest and flattest of the land masses. It is a land of hills, low plateaus and vast plains. The land is old. Its basement rocks consist of the pre-Cambrian shield, formed in the earth's early geological history, more than three billion years ago.

Because of lack of water, nearly 70 percent of Australia's total territory is unsettled. The so-called "outback" interior is a vast red and barren desert which fills much of the almost waterless heart of the country. Nevertheless, there are large grazing lands, especially for sheep, the total number of which is presently estimated at 150 million.

About 90 percent of the 14,000,000 population live on the east coast within a 30 to 250 mile-wide strip extending from Brisbane—about halfway down the coast—to Adelaide, which is really down under. The ocean off the beautiful golden sand beaches is a marine paradise; teeming with many varieties of tropical and game fish.

The first humans known to inhabit this island were the aborigines, who are believed to have come from southeast Asia at least 30,000 years ago. Most of the estimated 140,000 descendants now live and work in reservations or on pastoral properties.

We came here from New Zealand in our swing through the eastern and southern Pacific with stopovers in Hawaii and the legendary Fiji Islands. Before our scheduled meeting in Canberra with Prime Minister J. Malcolm Fraser, Joe Kingsbury Smith and I lunched with Chinese Ambassador Lin Ping and his staff to discuss our forthcoming trip to Peking and exchange views about the Soviet threat in the Pacific and Persian Gulf area.

Australia is now led by one of the outstanding statesmen in the world today. He recently returned from Europe, where he urged the NATO allies to support President Carter's strong stand against Soviet aggression in Afghanistan. He launched this week a new \$17.6 billion five-year defense buildup program to strengthen Australian naval and air forces in the Indian Ocean and provide greater facilities for the U.S. Navy in Australian ports.

The prime minister, who is the head of the center-right Liberal-National Country Party coalition, received us the morning after what the local press described as "the most important and most significant" speech he had made in parliament since his government took office in 1975. That was his announcement of the increased defense spending program.

The 49-year-old prime minister is a tall, craggy, forthright, no-nonsense type whose rather dour manner reflects his Scottish ancestry. One does not banter with him nor is he likely to be remembered for his jocularity. But there is a strong leadership quality about him.

He and Britain's Margaret Thatcher have done more than any other government leaders to support President Carter and alert the Free World to the potentially grave danger of the Soviet move into Afghanistan.

Convinced that the ultimate objective of Soviet policy is world domination, he believes that failure to make it unmistakably clear to Moscow that the West won't tolerate further aggression could tempt the Soviets to attempt to take over the Persian Gulf oil fields or risk other aggressive actions which could lead to nuclear war. He recalled that both World Wars I and II started because of the West's weakness and failure to make clear they would fight, if necessary, to protect their vital interests.

"The first and second world wars started as a result of weakness and appeasement," he told us in an exclusive interview. "They started from the false view that if you feed an aggressor's appetite, it will be diminished. It never happens that way. It grows."

"Maybe it would be good for all of us to read history from 1936 on—from the Olympic Games in Berlin on. Hitler marching into the Rhineland. Italy into Ethiopia. Then all the rest, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland. It was step by step. It led to the ultimate calamity with tens of millions killed."

"It was, as Churchill said, an unnecessary war, and it happened because neither France nor Britain nor the United States took the sort of actions that were necessary to avert it. It could have been stopped in 1936 (when Hitler sent the Nazi armies into the Rhineland against the advice of his generals)."

The Soviet leadership, the prime minister added, must be given clear signals that the invasion of Afghanistan is "thus far and no farther."

Prime Minister Fraser believes that if World War III comes, it is more likely to start in the Middle East, Asia or Africa than in Europe. He said he could not believe the Soviet leaders were so "insane" that they would challenge the West in Europe because they must know that that would certainly lead to a world nuclear war.

"One of the things I expressed both in Washington and Europe," he added, "was that the real dangers to the world are not likely to come in Europe itself where the divisions have been made, the lines drawn, and the commitments made."

"The real dangers are likely to come in the oil producing areas, and in the Third World countries of Asia and Africa, where there aren't clear lines—in areas where the Soviets have found themselves able and willing to use either their own troops directly as in Afghanistan, or Cuban soldiers in Africa, and Vietnamese armies in Indochina."

"It is in these areas where I hope the western powers will show more attention, especially the European powers who have tended to be inward looking a bit. If a major confrontation occurs in one of these grey areas, they are likely to be drawn in. You cannot stand aloof. You cannot remain un-

affected, especially if oil is involved. The only real safety any of us can have is to prevent the dangers before they arise."

When asked whether he found the European leaders, especially the West German and French, somewhat weak-kneed about standing up to Russia over the threat posed to the Persian Gulf area by Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and failing to support President Carter as strongly, for example, as he and Margaret Thatcher have, the prime minister replied:

"I regarded the communique that was issued by the chancellor of West Germany and the president of France as a very forthright document. It made it plain that what happened in Afghanistan could set in train step-by-step consequences of the gravest implications for the world.

"What they said, in essence, is that if the Soviets make other aggressive moves, it could lead to war. It's not spelled out but that is the message Moscow should have got from the Franco-German communique. It was a strong and good statement in support of President Carter and the United States and it needs to be understood that way. It also affirmed the importance and vitality of the western alliance. Margaret Thatcher made her own comments which were very rugged and forthright."

Asked if he thought the United States could count on the immediate military support of France and West Germany if it became involved in a conflict with Russia in the Persian Gulf area, Prime Minister Fraser said:

"I believe you could count on the NATO allies. I wouldn't say that's only a belief. It's a conviction because I think Europe would have no choice at all. If the Soviets move into the oil areas, they can determine the destiny, the life and survival of every industry in Europe."

The vitally important role Australia plays in the defense of the south and western Pacific areas, including our own Pacific coast, involves facilities made available here for the American-manned world's largest radar installation for tracking Soviet missiles and spy satellites. This installation is a key part of the American early-warning system.

Kingsbury Smith will tell you more about it, and other interesting details of our interview with Prime Minister Fraser.●

TEXTILE HALL WINS EXPORT AWARD

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the inventive and aggressive merchandising of American goods abroad by the Textile Hall Corp. of Greenville, S.C., was recently recognized by the U.S. Department of Commerce through the presentation of the Presidential "E" Award. It is with pride and pleasure that I share with you the following release:

Textile Hall Corp., Greenville, S.C., today received the Presidential "E" Award for outstanding performance in promoting U.S. international trade.

The company, a non-profit service organization that puts U.S. manufacturers in touch with potential foreign buyers through its international show facilities, was cited for its outstanding creative marketing and promotional services to U.S. exporters.

According to the Commerce Department the American Textile Machinery Exhibition-International, which Textile Hall sponsors every two years, ranks high among U.S. trade shows in attracting foreign visitors.

The company promotes the exhibition world-wide through mailings to 15,000 foreign mills, textile associations, airlines, travel agents, banks and U.S. embassies and consulates. It advertises in 28 foreign textile publications and prints promotional material in a variety of foreign languages. In addition to its activities in Europe and Africa, Textile Hall also promotes the exhibition in China, working through appropriate government ministries.

The "E" Award was presented to Dr. Robert C. Edmonds, Chairman of the Board of Textile Hall, by Margaret Patrick, director, U.S. Department of Commerce district office, Columbia, S.C., on behalf of Secretary of Commerce Philip M. Klutznick.

The "E" Award consists of a certificate signed by Secretary Klutznick on behalf of President Carter, an "E" flag and "E" lapel pins.●

A GRIM BEGINNING FOR SOVIET JEWS—1980

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, the brutal and callous Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has violated an innocent nation, has resulted in the murder of thousands of blameless civilians, has undermined détente with the United States, and has threatened the peace of the entire world. It has also claimed another victim: the Soviet Jew. While not directly—or even indirectly—involved in any way in the aggression against Afghanistan, the fate of the Soviet Jewish community has become inextricably linked to it, because its well-being is closely tied to Soviet concern about American opinion and actions. While the "old men" in the Kremlin were concerned about most-favored-nation trade status, the ratification of Salt II, and a host of other bilateral negotiations with the United States, we, here in the Congress, and the administration were able to exercise some leverage with respect to Soviet Jewish emigration, "Prisoners-of-Conscience" and related matters. That is not to say that we were always, or even often successful, in reversing Soviet policy with respect to Soviet Jewry. However, we have, over the last number of years, seen enough evidence to suggest that what we said, our resolutions, our adoptions of prisoners and "Refusniks," our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements, our participation in the annual vigils of freedom, our individual and "Dear Colleague" letters to Soviet officials, among other acts, did indeed have an impact. Our actions, combined with those policy decisions that the Soviets hoped we would make—Salt II, trade concessions, and so forth—resulted in many of the "Prisoners of Conscience" being released last April, and in emigration

figures for the year 1979 that surpass previous years. The situation in Russia remained one of discrimination and repression, but at least we were making some progress on a number of fronts.

With the invasion of Afghanistan came a distinct chill in the relations between our two countries. And as we quite properly sought different means—economic and diplomatic—to convey our outrage to the Soviet officials, we similarly found our leverage with respect to Soviet Jewry diminished. This fact was immediately evidenced in the newest emigration statistics that we have received: In 1979, 51,300 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. Emigration peaked in October when 4,746 left. That figure declined by 30 percent in December—the month of the invasion—and January saw a further decline in the number of emigres. Beyond that, OVIR offices—for processing prospective emigres—have been closed in Kiev, Chernovtsy, Mogilev-Polotsk, and Tashkent, and those Jews continuing to seek to emigrate have been subject to a new and more malicious round of repression, harassment. Add to all of this the shameful but nonetheless bold action of decreeing internal exile for Nobel laureate Andrei Sakharov.

While we are concerned that our ability to influence the Kremlin may be diminished, this is not a time to retreat or back away from our attempts to do so. On the contrary, this is a time when we should be reevaluating what we can do to help the Jews of the Soviet Union, and how we can continue to communicate with them as much as possible so that they do not feel so isolated and anxious about our commitment to them.

Coordinating our activities and advising on the best ways to make them effective will no doubt be the various local Soviet Jewry organizations that have been formed by dedicated volunteers throughout this country. In my own geographic area this truly life-saving work is spearheaded by the Long Island Committee for Soviet Jewry. Hardly a full day had passed after my first election to Congress when I was contacted by Lynn Singer, now the president of the Long Island committee and asked to participate in their adopt-a-prisoner-of-conscience program. I readily agreed, and that was the beginning of a 4-year correspondence with a young gentleman by the name of Anatoly Altman who was serving a lengthy sentence under strict regime because of his desire to emigrate to Israel.

That correspondence ended, happily, just about 1 year ago when Altman was suddenly released from prison last April and allowed to leave the Soviet Union and go to Israel. He is presently living a happy and productive life there, learning the language, learning a trade, and newly married. In September, he visited me in my office in Washington, and I have to confess to

my colleagues that meeting with him, talking to him, sharing his pleasure in his freedom—the first he's even known in his life—and listening to his accounts of the imprisonment that had used up one-quarter of his life brought me more satisfaction than almost anything else that I have been able to accomplish as a Member of the House of Representatives. More than that, it reassured me that the constant letters to him and to Soviet authorities, the numerous CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements, and other entreaties on his behalf had been effective and should be continued with respect to his fellow prisoners and the hundreds of "Refusniks."

Working closely with the Long Island Committee I have adopted several prisoners and numerous "Refusnik" families. We have been successful with some, but with not enough of them. As we move through this period of chilly relations with the Soviet Union we must continue to make our voices heard in Moscow so that they are not under the misapprehension that in the midst of the present swirl of world events we have forgotten the "Refusniks," or abandoned the prisoners. Now, more than ever we must stand by them.●

DENVER DICKERSON, A NEVADA INSTITUTION, RETIRES

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in saluting a fellow Nevadan for 35 years of distinguished service to the Federal Government on the occasion of his retirement today.

Denver Dickerson, staff director of the Joint Committee on Printing, first came to the Hill in 1955 as a press and executive secretary for Senator Alan Bible of Nevada. By then he had already had a long and noteworthy career in my home State.

He was born in Nevada's capital, Carson City, the son of a former Governor. He was educated in Carson City and Reno schools and graduated with a journalism degree from the University of Nevada, Reno.

He began his career as a reporter for the Reno Evening Gazette in 1934, and later went on to publish the Carson Chronicle in the 1930's and the Nevada State News, a weekly newspaper serving Reno, in the 1950's.

In between his publishing jobs he was elected to two terms in the Nevada Legislature, serving as speaker of the assembly in 1943, and was believed to be the youngest man to hold that position.

He is a past president of the Nevada State Press Association and a member of the National Press Club.

Dickerson served with Senator Bible until 1963 when he was appointed by

President John Kennedy as Governor of Guam, a post he held for 6 years.

He resumed his Nevadā connection in 1970 when he went to work as special assistant for my colleague, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, and went on to serve the U.S. Congress on the Joint Committee on Printing.

But these impressive career highlights do not tell the full story of my friend Denver Dickerson. Although he was physically removed from the State during much of his proud professional accomplishments, he really never left Nevada. Denver kept in close contact with his many Nevada friends. He was an unofficial, unpaid adviser to many State public officials.

He has been, compassionate, and often humorous understanding and insight into Nevada and her people, places, and events. When I was first elected to Congress, Denver was one of the first transplanted Nevadans to whom I turned for survival tactics in Washington. I will never regret that decision.

Despite the job pressure and the many years of dedicated service, Denver never lost the pioneer spirit and western flair.

He is a pleasant, rewarding person to know and I feel fortunate to be his friend.

I wish Denver and his wife—the very best in their much deserved retirement.●

AGRICULTURAL RENEWABLE ENERGY AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1980

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today my colleagues, Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. HEPTER, and I are introducing legislation that would establish the position of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Renewable Energy Development in the Department of Agriculture. It is my firm belief that the need for an integrated, high-profile approach for bringing renewable energy technologies to our Nation's agricultural sector warrants establishment of this important office, and I am confident that my other colleagues will recognize and support this effort.

There is no question that the energy crisis threatens the well-being of our whole society. Events during 1979, including the ferment in Iran, long gas lines, skyrocketing prices, and the growing specter of supply cutoffs have forced us at last to address this perilous situation and seek remedies. Notable progress has been made in recent months in reducing our overall energy consumption, and the Congress has moved, finally, to act on major energy legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are by no means clear of the dangerous course which we have been following by our shortsighted dependence on a finite

source of fossil fuels, almost half of it from foreign sources. And, this fragile dependence is particularly threatening to the Nation's farm sector, which perhaps more than any other sector is adversely affected by fuel supply disruptions and escalating prices.

That the agricultural sector of this country is highly vulnerable to interruptions in fossil fuels supplies is beyond question. In recent testimony before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Jim Williams made the following observation:

In 1978, an estimated 13.8 quads of energy were used in agricultural forestry production and processing, rural housing, and rural vehicular use (table 1). This represents about 18 percent of the total energy used in the U.S. Of the total energy used in agricultural production, 93 percent was derived from petroleum based energy. (Emphasis added.)

TABLE 1.—ENERGY USED IN AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, AND RURAL AMERICA, 1978

Sector	Quads	Percent derived from petroleum resources	Percent of U.S. total
Agricultural production.....	2.5	93	3.2
Food processing.....	1.0	84	1.3
Forestry.....	2.7	51	3.5
Rural housing.....	3.1	71	3.5
Rural vehicular use.....	4.5	100	5.8
	13.8	82	17.8

These data indicate the significant dependency of agriculture and rural America on petroleum-based energy. Of the total 78 quads of energy used in the U.S. in 1978, about 74 percent was from petroleum products. Therefore, the rural areas are substantially more dependent on petroleum fuels than the United States as a whole.

Obviously, an interruption in fuel supplies during the critical planting and harvesting periods could present more than just a difficult time for American farmers. Such a happening could spell economic disaster for a nation that is used to ample food and fiber supplies at reasonable prices, and heavily reliant on our agricultural surpluses to relieve a foreign trade deficit that is worsened by oil imports.

Yet, it would not take a severe fuel supply disruption to bring American farmers face to face with disaster. Already on the brink of insolvency because of chronically depressed commodity prices, record high interest rates, and capricious Government actions, including embargoes, many farmers are now faced with economic collapse because of escalating energy and petrobased fertilizer costs that have jumped by 35 to 90 percent in 1 year.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the potential for rescuing our agricultural economy from disaster begins with the realization that farmers are the producers not just of food and fiber, but of energy as well. And that is why I believe this legislation is so important.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the three of us introducing this legislation here

today represent such a mix of agricultural interests gives testimony to both the breadth and intensity of the problem itself, as well as the immense potential that exists to achieve its resolution. From the sugarcane fields of Mr. HEFTEL's Hawaii, to the feedlots of Mr. ALEXANDER's Arkansas, to the cornfields of my own State of Iowa, the raw materials already exist for the production of great quantities of useful and renewable energy. The only thing lacking is the catalyst and coordinating mechanism needed to make this transition to energy independence as expeditious, orderly, and efficient as possible. It is our belief that an Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development would provide this badly needed stimulation and direction.

Mr. Speaker, more than 1 year ago I introduced the National Alcohol Fuel and Farm Commodity Production Act, which was designed to spur the domestic production of alcohol fuel from renewable resources in both large- and small-scale applications. Today, that measure has been largely incorporated into title II of S. 932, the synthetic fuels bill now in conference, and I am hopeful that soon there will be funding available for the encouragement of alcohol fuel production facilities. Our liquid fuel needs are great, and ethyl alcohol can do much in the near term to help us meet these needs.

The measure we are introducing here today goes far beyond an attempt to spur the production of merely ethanol from grains, however. While alcohol fuel from biomass, and especially grains, has received most of the attention recently, it is only one of the renewable energy forms that could be expected to provide the Nation's farms and rural communities with secure and reasonably priced energy in the near to mid term. Methane from animal and vegetable wastes, electricity from wind, and a wide range of solar applications are technologically and economically viable today for onfarm and rural community use. With some encouragement and direction provided by the Federal Government, our farms and rural communities could be largely energy self-sufficient by the turn of the century. This goal is what this measure we are introducing here today is intended to help achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that when the President released his budget request for fiscal year 1981 several weeks ago, I was greatly disturbed by the almost total absence of funding requested for energy-related programs within the Department of Agriculture. While energy is clearly the Nation's No. 1 problem, the USDA budget reflected little recognition of the magnitude of this problem or its consequences for agriculture. Without knowing precisely how or why this oversight occurred, I believe that one conclusion can be safely drawn: The Department of Agriculture sorely

needs a high-profile, authoritative official charged with the development and advocacy of a coherent renewable energy program for the agricultural sector. That, in essence, is what this legislation is intended to bring about.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate during the past year to have met many experts in the field of renewable energy who have broadened my own realization of what is "do-able" if only we end our preoccupation with interminable studies and instead apply new ideas operationally to what we know today. I firmly believe that there is no better place in our society to go than to the farm sector to take advantage of this type philosophy. The residents of our farms and rural communities have the pioneering, give-it-a-try spirit that has already resulted in breakthroughs that the experts had discounted at the theoretical level.

In my opinion, the most exciting feature of the renewable energy forms that we are talking about here is the potential for their integration in a way that enhances the environment—rather than doing damage to it—while reducing energy costs and increasing available energy supplies. There soon could be many rural communities like the one in my district, for instance, that will make use of existing livestock feeding operations to serve as the integral component of a renewable energy system. Such a system will utilize the livestock wastes to produce methane, use part of the methane as process heat for an alcohol facility, and scrub up the rest of the methane for use in the municipal gas system, while using part of the corn normally fed to livestock to produce the alcohol, with the high-protein byproduct from the alcohol production replacing the corn and actually resulting in improved livestock performance. On all counts—economic, environmental, and social—such a community-centered system stands as the wave of the future. Furthermore, an added benefit of this approach is that it is not something that requires decades of effort or billions of dollars to make a reality. Next to conservation, these renewable energy technologies are the least capital intensive, most promising near-term energy alternative that we have.

There is need for concerted action by the Department of Agriculture if our farmers and rural communities are to take full advantage of their immense potential as energy producers. The USDA, with its long established network of county FmHA, ASCS, and extension offices, is uniquely well-suited to bring an effective renewable energy program to the Nation's farms and small towns. The most efficient way to achieve energy self-sufficiency for our farms and rural communities is for there to be someone designated within the Department of Agriculture with the authority of an Assistant Secretary and a clear-cut mandate to foster renewable energy development and application. There must be some-

one to identify the resource base available to the agricultural sector and to separate fact from fiction when assessing technologies and cost. There is a need for a person who, by and with the consent of the Congress, is responsible for interfacing with officials of other agencies and Departments whose actions impact significantly on the energy activities and future of rural America: The Department of Energy; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; the Department of Transportation; the Environmental Protection Agency; and the rest.

Perhaps most importantly, an Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development within USDA would provide an epicenter for all energy-related activity within the Department, thus helping to give renewable energy development the high visibility it needs, while helping to prevent wasteful duplication, fragmentation, and the type of bureaucratic inertia that lack of accountability breeds. The identification and monitoring of needed research programs ranging from the modification of engines and farm equipment to run on pure, on-the-farm-produced alcohol to the various uses of the high-protein byproduct that results from ethanol fermentation could be given direction and status by this official. In budget and funding battles, renewable energy matters would have an advocate worthy of their importance. In short, the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development would fill a very dangerous vacuum that exists in the Department of Agriculture, and is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that those who will be most directly affected by this legislation, especially farmers and rural residents, are painfully aware of how badly such a renewable energy program is needed. I have discussed this matter from time to time over the past year with many of the people and groups who are most intimately involved in this area, and I sense broad-based support for the concept embodied in this measure. Notably, the National Gasohol Commission, at its fifth annual meeting, in San Antonio, Tex., last December, overwhelmingly endorsed a resolution which calls for the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Renewable Resources. It is my firm conviction that the Federal Government must adopt a positive, activist approach to our energy problem, and that it is time that it gets in step with the people. I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation as one step toward bringing energy self-sufficiency to the Nation's farmers and rural communities, thereby insuring the Nation's consumers of a secure and plentiful supply of food, fiber—and energy.

I insert the bill in its entirety at this point:

H.R. 6689

A bill to authorize the appointment of an

Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development in the Department of Agriculture and to provide for the development and coordination of Department of Agriculture programs in order to increase energy self-sufficiency in the agricultural sector

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be referred to as the "Agricultural Renewable Energy Development and Management Act of 1980".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the Nation's agricultural sector can continue to be productive only if it has a secure and reasonably priced supply of energy;

(2) overdependence on fossil fuels leaves the Nation's agricultural sector vulnerable both to interruptions in supplies of such fuels and to rapidly rising prices;

(3) the Nation's agricultural sector has the capability of becoming a producer of various forms of renewable energy; and

(4) there is need for a highly visible and coordinated program within the Department of Agriculture directed at identifying and developing renewable energy technologies in order that such technologies may be applied to the agricultural sector.

PURPOSES

SEC. 3. The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to accelerate the development and production of renewable energy for direct application in on-farm and rural environments by providing for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development in the Department of Agriculture, who shall be responsible for the development and management of an energy self-sufficiency program for the agricultural sector;

(2) to assure the development and implementation of a comprehensive agricultural, forestry, and rural energy program in order to achieve a 50 percent reduction in petroleum and natural gas usage by rural residents and communities of this Nation before the year 2000;

(3) to organize the technical and managerial resources and expertise of the Department of Agriculture in order to make the fullest possible use of its existing county office structure in the dissemination of renewable energy technology information;

(4) to provide, by establishing the position of the Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy Development, an effective point of contact for the Department in its dealings with other relevant agencies and departments, including the Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; and

(5) to authorize changes in existing programs and authorities of the Department of Agriculture, consistent with, but not duplicative of, programs and authorities of the Department of Energy, relating to research, technology transfer, and operational activities, in order to achieve maximum energy self-sufficiency in the agricultural sector.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "biomass" means agricultural commodities, forest products, and wastes and residues of such commodities and products, which can be used as fuel or for the production of alcohol fuels, industrial hydrocarbons, and other energy sources. Such term includes grain, corn stalks, wheat, rice,

sorghum, cottonseed, and peanut hulls, fruits and vegetables and their processing byproducts and residues, aquatic plants, specific energy farm crops, animal wastes, wood and wood products, bark, wood pulp and chips, residues from logging and paper manufacturing, and animal waste products.

(2) the term "renewable energy forms" includes all forms of energy that are essentially derived from domestic, nondepletable sources, such as methane and other gases from biomass, alcohol fuels produced from biomass, electricity generated from wind, small hydroelectric power projects, passive and active solar energy systems, and energy derived from the direct burning of biomass.

(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) The term "coproducts", when used with respect to alcohol fuel production, means the various components remaining after the production of alcohol fuels from grains (such as dried distiller dark grains (DDDG)).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 5. (a) There shall be in the Department of Agriculture an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Renewable Energy Development (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Assistant Secretary"), to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be responsible for performing the duties required by this Act and such other duties relating to the purposes of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) Beginning October 1, 1980, the Secretary shall, upon the request of the Assistant Secretary, provide such resources of the Department of Agriculture and such outside consultants as the Assistant Secretary may need in order to carry out the duties referred to in subsection (a). There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1981, September 30, 1982, September 30, 1983, and September 30, 1984, such sums as may be necessary for the Assistant Secretary to carry out this Act.

(c) The Assistant Secretary shall receive basic pay at the rate payable for Level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

ASSESSMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES AND GOALS

SEC. 6. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall conduct a study reviewing the Nation's agricultural, forestry, and rural energy needs, resources, practices, legal authorities, programs, and such other subjects as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) In conducting the study referred to in subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall—

(1) identify appropriate agricultural, forestry, and rural energy objectives;

(2) determine the range of renewable energy forms which could be used by the agricultural sector to achieve the purposes of this Act;

(3) assess the relative utility of each such renewable energy form in achieving such purposes;

(4) identify the ways in which such renewable energy forms can be utilized most effectively and expeditiously in providing the Nation's agricultural sector with a secure, environmentally benign, and reasonable priced supply of energy;

(5) identify and develop methods of upgrading practices used in agricultural and forestry production, processing, and marketing, and in rural communities in order to conserve energy;

(6) identify the policies and procedures necessary to ensure that the production and marketing of agricultural commodities and

forest products will not be interrupted or otherwise diminished by shortages of fossil fuels;

(7) identify ways to minimize the adverse consequences of renewable energy production and use on agricultural, forest, and rural lands, natural resources, and communities;

(8) assess existing and anticipated Federal and State laws, policies, programs, and regulations affecting renewable energy production and use and the conservation of energy in agriculture, forestry, and rural lands and communities;

(9) evaluate the effectiveness of existing Department of Agriculture programs and policies in achieving the purposes of this Act, and identify ways to improve such programs and policies; and

(10) analyze the adequacy of existing legal authorities and funding, and recommend changes in such authorities and funding to better achieve the purposes of this Act.

(c) The study required under subsection (a) shall be completed no later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and updated as necessary, but at least once every 3 years. Such study and each such update shall be submitted to Congress.

(d) In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall use, to the maximum extent feasible, such analyses, assessments, evaluations, and other information as may be available from the other Federal agencies, including the National Alcohol Fuels Commission.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR RENEWABLE ENERGY PRODUCTION, USE, AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM

SEC. 7. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall develop an Agricultural Sector Energy Production, Use, and Conservation Program (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Program") setting forth measures, actions, funding levels, and other means for achieving the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Program shall be based on the Assistant Secretary's study prepared pursuant to section 6 of this Act, as well as other relevant data, including the renewable resource assessments and renewable resource programs prepared under the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977. In addition, the Program shall be consistent with energy policies and programs developed by the Department of Energy.

(c) The Program shall be developed in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies and public and private organizations, in accordance with such procedures as the Assistant Secretary may prescribe to ensure public participation.

(d) Final plans and specifications for the Program shall be completed and submitted to the President and the Congress no later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall be reviewed and revised when necessary, but at least once every 3 years, and resubmitted to the President and the Congress.

ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 8. The Secretary, with the assistance of the Assistant Secretary, shall prepare annual reports evaluating the implementation of the Program and submit them to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives by February 1 of each year, the first such report to be submitted by February 1, 1982.

AGRICULTURAL, FORESTRY, AND RURAL ENERGY RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Assistant Secretary may implement a renewable energy applied re-

search program, using the programs and authorities established under this Act and such other programs and authorities as are available to the Secretary. Applied renewable energy research conducted under this section shall not duplicate, to any significant degree, the efforts of any program of the Department of Energy. Any program developed under this subsection shall include applied research to develop—

(1) low-cost renewable energy forms for use within the agricultural sector and rural communities of this Nation;

(2) economical means for adapting existing machinery and structures to renewable energy forms, such as by modification of engines and retrofitting of buildings and equipment;

(3) systems for integrating two or more renewable energy forms into a single operation, such as the integration of methane digestion units, alcohol production units, and low-grade heat solar applications;

(4) applications of renewable energy coproducts, especially high protein residue of alcohol from grain production processes; and

(5) the optimum interaction of such renewable energy forms with the agricultural and rural community environment, with particular emphasis on the balancing of biomass energy production with the constraints of land availability and the proper use and conservation of soil and water resources under such system.

(b) The Assistant Secretary may implement an agricultural, forestry, and rural community renewable energy education extension program to disseminate the findings of research performed under this Act and to encourage farmers, owners of forest lands, rural residents, and other members of rural communities to adopt projects for the production and use of renewable energy, including energy conservation techniques. Such extension program shall be coordinated with the Energy Extension Service of the Department of Energy and may include onsite demonstrations of techniques by which farmers and owners of forestry land, rural residents, and rural communities can achieve energy self-sufficiency.●

EVELYN C. WHITE—WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 15, 1980, the Beverly Hospital Foundation of Montebello, Calif., will honor their "Woman of the Year," Mrs. Evelyn C. White, at a testimonial dinner which will take place at the Industry Hills Exhibit Center in the city of Industry, Calif.

Evelyn was selected by the foundation for her tireless and unselfish work throughout the community. Evelyn is an example for us all because of her deep concern and understanding for her fellow man.

The record of recommendations and achievements throughout Evelyn's 90 years is indeed impressive and I join with her many admirers in offering my words of praise.

Evelyn White was born and raised within 3 miles of Montebello, in my

congressional district. She published her own newspaper beginning in the early 1920's. She is a pioneer in the development of the area.

Evelyn has helped to found and organize community and cultural organizations in the area, such as the East Los Angeles Business and Professional Women's Club and the Poppy Trail Parlor of the Native Daughters of the Golden West. She was curator for the Taylor Ranch, converting the ranch-house into a home for the preservation of culture and heritage of the area.

She has received many other community awards, too numerous to mention here. I can only say that it is an honor and a pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to this fine woman from my area on the occasion of receiving yet another award as "Woman of the Year" of the Beverly Hospital Foundation.●

PEACETIME REGISTRATION NEEDED NOW

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Wall Street Journal carried a very timely and thought-provoking editorial on the issue of peacetime registration with the Selective Service System. Because of the important vote that will be taken in the House Appropriations Committee tomorrow, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues to consider the constructive arguments presented in the editorial:

THE REGISTRATION SHUFFLE

When Jimmy Carter announced his draft registration just a little while ago, it seemed like an unexceptional step. Yet now it's in trouble in the House and about to be dragged through the courts. Some days a democracy can't do anything right.

The House Armed Services Committee gave the plan its first whack by announcing that it simply would not authorize registration of women. The Carter people responded logically enough to this attack from their conservative flank: They dropped the woman part of the package and went for the men. This move intensified the baying of the liberals, who decried the betrayal of equal rights and said they'd go to court to get the whole registration scheme thrown out.

But this little whipsaw was only a beginning. On the eve of appropriations hearings Senator Mark Hatfield said he'd filibuster against the plan. On the one hand, registration was the first step to the war-mongering draft: "If we had not had the draft, we would not have been in Vietnam." On the other hand, the Carter registration plan was not warlike enough: A Selective Service report claimed it would cut only seven days off mobilization time. So, the Senator argued triumphantly, we got an infringement of freedom for "nothing more than a symbolic gesture."

The Senator's remarks provided the "hard-headed" theme for the hearings that followed. Republican Lawrence Coughlin

said there that registration was a "useless gesture sending the wrong signal to the American people that we are doing something when we are not." Republican Joseph McDade said he wasn't interested in steps that "may not be meaningful." Democrat Martin Sabo cited the paltry seven-day time saving.

In the end Representatives Coughlin and McDade joined their Republican colleague Silvio Conte and three Democrats in defeating the proposal; it took a special compromise vote to find a way to send the idea forward to the full appropriations committee.

In this whole process we heard a good deal more than we want to of what amounts to a "tough-guy" argument from the left. "There's nobody here but us hawks," the line goes. "We want nothing other than an effective, beefed-up defense. That's why we don't want draft registration: It's not good enough." It's a neat position, since it lets you sound hard but escape the possible electoral consequences of actually voting for a draft measure.

But what do these people think a truly "effective" defense would actually look like? Do they really think that our present contingency plans would work without a hitch, as that Selective Service report assumes they would? Do they really think the Soviets, gauging our intentions, don't know the difference between a plan on paper and a plan in operation?

Given the simple prudence of registration and the mood of the country, we assume the administration's bill will move through Congress despite the kind of harassment it is now encountering. We only hope that when the process is over our representatives are called to account for their behavior, and particularly for talking out of one side of their mouths while voting out of the other.●

AID TO ISRAEL

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, no single area of the world has proved to be as important to our Nation's security as the Middle East. The oil embargo of 1973 and the subsequent damage done to our economy by OPEC price manipulation have proved that point. Recent political reversals in Iran and Afghanistan have only underscored the degree of our vulnerability to our adversaries in that part of the world.

As we face the challenge of checking Soviet influence in the Persian Gulf region, and as we work to expand our own, we are fortunate to have an ally like Israel by our side. Fortunate, because Israel is a stable democracy and a faithful friend of the United States. Fortunate, because Israel has consistently spoken out in support of U.S. foreign policy when others of our allies have remained silent. And fortunate, because Israel is a strong military power, situated strategically between the Mediterranean and the Red Seas. It is precisely this strength that makes Israel so valuable an ally to our Nation. War is less likely because Israel is strong. The prospects for a peaceful pro-American alliance be-

tween Israel, Egypt, Morocco, Sudan, and Saudi Arabia are enhanced because Israel is strong. And it is clearly in America's interest to keep Israel strong.

Unfortunately for the United States, however, the Israeli economy is suffering. In 1979, inflation in Israel ran at a rate of 111 percent; the price of gasoline hit \$2.50 per gallon; dairy prices quadrupled; and utility charges nearly tripled. Israel's foreign debt has reached \$15 billion—this in a country with a GNP of only \$14 billion last year. The Government has responded to this economic crisis by cutting real spending by 6 percent in nearly every Government ministry, and by ordering a 6 percent manpower reduction. In addition, the Government has put a freeze on all new construction of public buildings, schools, and hospitals, and has planned reductions in badly needed foreign military purchases. But this extreme austerity program will not be enough to insure a strong Israeli economy. She will need our help.

Today, I urge every member of the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees, as they consider Israel's request for United States aid, to bear in mind the tremendous role Israel plays in the protection of U.S. interests in the Middle East. I urge them to consider economic aid to Israel as an investment which will pay incalculable dividends to future generations of Americans.

Foreign aid has always been looked on with skepticism by my constituents, but I am convinced that the great majority of them appreciate the significant part Israel plays in our overall defense plans. And I am sure that they support aid to Israel as a prudent investment in the future of the free world. A very wise man from my district, Will Rogers, used to say that:

If you want to know when the next war is coming, just watch the U.S. and see when it starts cutting down on its defense. It's the surest barometer in the world.

I submit today that a strong Israel is vital to our defense and that now is no time to "start cutting it down." If anything, I would urge the committees to take a hard look at increasing United States aid to Israel as a sign of our intention to maintain a strong posture in the Middle East.●

BONNIE DROEGE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. RICHARD BRUCE CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year more than 250,000 secondary school students wrote speeches addressing the theme of "My Role in America's Future." A winning

contestant is selected from each State and then brought to Washington, D.C. for the final judging where five national scholarships are awarded as top prizes.

I am proud to announce that this year's winner from Wyoming is Bonnie Helen Bernadette Droege, a 17-year-old East High School student from Cheyenne. I would like to share with my colleagues Ms. Droege's speech, as I feel it is definitely worth reading and thinking about:

MY ROLE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Bonnie Droege)

Remember the story of the Lady and the Tiger? The condemned man was thrown into a pit, where the whole kingdom watched, as he made his choice between two doors. . . Behind one, a beautiful maiden. Behind the other, a ferocious tiger. Death, and life. The tale, unique of its kind, leaves the end of the story to our imagination. The choice is ours.

I stand, not in a pit, but in a country. My reason for being here?—not a sin, but the heritage and the promise of my birth. I am a citizen of the United States, and my choice is either the death of a country and a way of life, or the future and the glory of my nation. My role in America's future, as that prisoner in the pit had a role, is to make this choice.

The difference, however, between my choice and the condemned man's, is that I know what is behind those doors. I must choose the one door that opens to "Life, liberty, and the joyful pursuit of happiness." Behind this door that I open lies my patriotism, and my belief in America. The words are well-used—"patriotism" to many people means simply saying the pledge of allegiance. My patriotism to America means more than that. To be truly patriotic to my country I must be educated, so that I can understand my government and the workings of our society. I must hold down a worthy job when I have finished my education, so that I won't have to live off this nation's bounty. I have an obligation to bring the children I will have someday a good home, and a stable family life, so that they too will be able to step forward someday as the leaders and foundations of our country. A nation itself is not land or farms or building, but the people that inhabit it. John F. Kennedy once said: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." I can benefit my country's future by finishing my education and joining the adult people of America as a working individual, giving of my talent and abilities so that our country will be great.

My belief in America is also important. Just as I must develop my mind and my physical ability to contribute to my nation, I must have emotional faith that the U.S.A. is the greatest country on earth. I believe that this kind of help is just as necessary as the other. The United States of America to me—is the best place on earth to be born, and to live in. There are no starving children in the United States. Our few poor are vastly better off than any other unfortunate people in the world. We have the grandest, most beautiful hot springs area on earth. Yellowstone National Park is a jewel to be proud of—and I am! From our giant cities to our sleepy little towns, we are the best educated, best fed, best entertained, best everything in the world! We pour out our aid to stricken countries like Nicaragua and India. We teach Hindu peasants how to

farm, and our old Batman series is a popular show—in Japan. We are the greatest country this world has seen any time in its three thousand year history. I'm proud of that, and I'm proud of my great country.

My role in America's future is to walk through the door of my choice, to grasp and to use the education and opportunities presented to me, and to be very, very proud of my great country—The United States of America.●

MITCHELL BILL PROVIDING FOR A COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL- LION HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF MAGGIE L. WALKER

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a legislative measure which would provide for the striking and public sale of a commemorative medallion in honor of an outstanding American black woman. This tribute is to Maggie Lena Walker, who had the distinguished honor of being the first woman president of an American bank. The bank survives today in the Consolidated Bank & Trust Co. in Richmond, Va.

Maggie Walker was born in Richmond, Va., on July 15, 1867, to William and Elizabeth Mitchell. Her immersion into public service began with her joining, at the age of 14, an organization called the Independent Order of St. Luke. This association, basically an insurance society, was created in 1867 in Baltimore, Md., for the expressed purpose of helping the sick and burying the dead during the post-Civil War period. In addition to this benevolent goal, the organization encouraged self-help and racial solidarity. It existed for awhile along with an earlier established fraternal order, the Grand Fountain of the United Order of True Reformers, a full-fledged mutual benefit stock company, incorporated in 1883. Its bank failed in 1910, leading to the demise of the True Reformers in 1911. During the course of her membership, Ms. Walker progressed rapidly through the ranks of the Independent Order of St. Luke—from secretary of Good Idea Council No. 16, to appointment as a delegate to the annual convention at Petersburg, Va., to grand sentinel; and on to even higher elected offices such as right worthy grand chief and national deputy. As executive secretary, Ms. Walker established councils in Virginia and West Virginia.

Educated in Richmond public and normal schools, Maggie Walker continued her studies at Virginia Union University, where she received an honorary master of science degree in 1925. Ms. Walker was a trustee of the university in 1931, and in that same year, was the director of a training and an industrial school in the District of Columbia and Virginia respectively.

Ms. Walker served as president of the Council of Colored Women, Inc.; as the vice president of the Negro Organization Society of Virginia; on the executive board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and with other fraternal organizations throughout her fruitful life.

Maggie Walker taught school from 1883 until 1886. It was in 1886 that she married Armstead Walker. After her marriage, she continued her interest in and association with the Independent Order of St. Luke, and became one of its strongest supporters.

Just prior to 1890, in honor of her tenacity, the Independent Order of St. Luke named Magdalene Council No. 125 for Ms. Walker. She subsequently proceeded to develop a proposal and governing rules for the formation of a juvenile branch of the organization, and was elected secretary of the endowment department in 1897.

In 1899 the order was suffering a serious decline in membership, cash availability, and indebtedness. The grand secretary, W. M. T. Forrester, refused to serve any longer because of a salary dispute and the floundering condition of the order. Maggie Walker accepted the position of grand secretary—or executive secretary—at a salary lower than that of Forrester's, but was extremely successful in revitalizing the work of the order. She raised the membership from 1,000 to 20,000 within 7 years. After 25 years had transpired, Ms. Walker was commended for her accomplishments: increases from a total of 57 action councils to 1,500; from 3,400 members to approximately 100,000; from assets of only \$31.66 to nearly \$400,000; and, the directing of the construction of a brand new four-story brick office building at 900 St. James Street in Richmond, replacing the old building. Also, the business of St. Luke now provided employment to 50 men and women as compared to only 5 original employees.

The order had varied business interests—a real estate association, a retail store, a printing plant, a bank, and a newspaper. The St. Luke Herald, of which Maggie Walker was editor, was begun in 1901 to satisfy the need for closer communication between members of the order and with the public. In 1903 Ms. Walker, under the order, directed the establishment of the St. Luke Penny Savings Bank, and served as its president until 1931. The name of the bank was changed to the St. Luke Bank & Trust Co.—after the Virginia Banking Division forced the separation of secret orders and their banks. It became one of the best managed and fastest growing financial institutions in the world. The Consolidated Bank & Trust Co., a continuation of the St. Luke Bank & Trust Co., was formed in 1931. The new, modern construction today, stands directly across the street—on opposite corners—from the old Consolidated Bank & Trust Co.; in Richmond.

Maggie Walker continued as executive secretary of the order until her death on December 15, 1934.

Many accolades and gratuities have been bestowed upon Maggie Walker as expressions of the high esteem in which others held her. The striking of a commemorative medallion in her honor will be a symbol of this Congress and the Nation's continued commitment to recognizing the contributions of great Americans.●

SHERYL LYNN BACK

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special and talented student from Wadsworth, Ohio. Her name is Sheryl Lynn Back, she is 15 years old, and she attends Highland High School.

Sheri delivered the winning speech from the State of Ohio in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary Voice of Democracy contest. The winning contestant in each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final competition.

Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the fact that Congress is hearing voices of frustration and disappointment from many parts of the country as we struggle to find solutions to the serious problems that have gripped this Nation. It is refreshing to hear the thoughts of the voice of our future and to reaffirm that our youth does indeed feel committed to this country's welfare and development.

Following is the text of Sheri's speech which she will be delivering here in Washington in a few short weeks. Sheri—I wish you lots of luck and the skill of Demosthenes:

I am a citizen of the United States of America. It is a free country. I am free. I am also frightened. The complete freedom of choices that are available overwhelm and confuse me. If I am to have any kind of a role in America's future, the many questions that I have will need answers.

Yet I have a strong confidence in knowing what America spells out for me: The "A" in America must stand for action. I cannot and will not sit back and let my future and my country's future slip by. If our country is to move forward, then we all must be willing to act against the bad and toward the good.

This then leads to the "M" in America—morality. So many people are saying that the morals of Americans have declined miserably—that we will fall as the Roman Empire did. I believe, however, that the good still exists in my country. "In God We Trust" must prevail. I can and will follow this belief in all aspects of my life.

The "E" in America stands for education. I have been going to school for two-thirds of my life. I will admit there are times when I am bored and believe I have learned enough. But I know this democratic nation succeeded because of the belief in education for everyone. I don't know what direction my education will lead me yet; I do know

that education is continuous. I can best help my country by keeping an open and inquisitive mind.

The "R" in America stands for respect. I don't throw trash from the car window because I respect my country's beauty. I don't run around at a football game while they are playing the national anthem. I am proud of my country. I respect it and I respect what it stands for. I could not and will not turn my back on my country.

The "I" in America stands for involvement. Apathy is a major fault in this country. A favorite statement made by Americans is "Oh, somebody else will do it." Well, somebody else might not do it or they might not do it right. It's a disgrace that a large percentage of citizens in the country do not exercise their right to vote. I have heard many times, "Why should I vote; it won't make a difference anyway." I may never run for political office but I intend to learn as much as I can about the political candidates and then, I will vote.

The "C" in America stands for concern. We have so many problems in our country—racial, fuel shortages, inflation, poverty, unemployment, world strife—all seem so impossible to solve. If everyone has concern for those problems and really cares, then solutions are possible. I, for one, am concerned.

The last letter in America, the "A" must also stand for action. This democratic nation was first a dream. It took action to make it what it is today. It will continue to take action to make it even better.

My role in America's future is not very well defined yet. I believe strongly, however, in "A"—action, "M"—morality, "E"—education, "R"—respect, "I"—involvement, "C"—concern and "A"—action; for all of these put together spell out a word that has a very big and special meaning. A word that stands for many different things to many different people. This magnificent word is America, my country. Even though I don't know specifically what my role will be, I believe in her greatness—past, present and future.●

AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I continue with the issues which Americans living abroad are concerned about as they try to represent America overseas.

The material follows:

ISSUE No. 25

Short title: Problems for Social Security Earnings Limits from Fluctuating Exchange Rates Abroad.

Summary of the problem: Some overseas Americans receiving Social Security Retirement Pensions work for employers who contribute to the Social Security Trust Fund. As such, their outside earnings are restricted to a given dollar amount above which they will lose their Social Security Benefits. Many of these retired Americans are paid in a foreign currency which is not fixed at a given value against the dollar but fluctuates daily against the dollar.

These retired Americans suffer from not being able to predict how much their overseas dollar incomes will be, hence are subjected to unexpected and most unfortunate losses of Social Security Benefits when the overseas currency appreciates.

The difficulty comes from the fact that these Americans are living in a foreign cur-

rency environment in which almost all of their expenditures are also in the foreign currency. The use of a dollar standard for them creates difficulties.

ACA's question: Why cannot some method be found to protect the Social Security Pensioner from loss of U.S. benefits through phantom (dollar apparent) changes in his overseas income due solely to changes in currency exchange rates?

The President's reply: "When these earnings of Americans abroad change in response to local inflationary impact of fluctuation in exchange rates, the workers may suffer by comparison with workers in the U.S. Only a small percentage of beneficiaries abroad have their benefits reduced as a result of the earnings test. The Social Security Administration has avoided using special indices for social security benefits according to the country of residence of the beneficiary, not only because of the severe administrative problems created by special indices, but also because of the policy to maintain uniform standards within the program to the greatest extent possible. In the United States, in spite of wide variations in wage levels and cost-of-living among different areas, the standards are uniform for all areas."

Unfortunately, the problem of the impact of moving exchange rates was not addressed specifically. The great problem with this new international phenomenon (triggered a few years ago by the United States) is that no one wants to examine the myriad implications of living with systems that function on fixed values in one currency while qualifying in moving values in another system. This difficulty of economic value relativity must be addressed.

ACA's renewed question: Despite the assurance that "only a small percentage of beneficiaries abroad" suffer from this problem, we feel that some further study of how to help our overseas pensioners is urgently needed. The problem occurs for the needy abroad whose circumstances are such that they "must" work to survive. That they have become the victims of international monetary capriciousness whereby they are the ones who pay for every gyrations in exchange rates no matter what force may be behind such monetary changes seems highly unfair. We appeal to the President once again for further study and positive redress to this problem for senior citizen Americans abroad.

ISSUE NO. 26

Short title: Cost of Living Problems for Retired Americans Abroad.

Summary of the problem: Related to the issue raised in Issue 25, is the problem of the irrelevance of fixing outside earning limits in dollars for retired Americans receiving Social Security Benefits in countries which have much higher costs-of-living than anywhere in the United States.

ACA's question: Why cannot some allowance be made for either paying benefits, or adjusting the outside earnings limits for those receiving Social Security Benefits abroad to take account of extraordinary costs-of-living in some overseas countries?

The President's reply: "The Social Security Administration has avoided using special indices for social security benefits according to the country of residence of the beneficiary, not only because of the severe administrative problems created by special indices, but also because of the policy to maintain uniform standards within the program to the greatest extent possible. In the United States, in spite of wide variations in wage levels and cost-of-living among different areas, the standards are uniform for all areas."

This reply once again raises the spectre of "severe administrative problems" to justify not giving further thought to the problems of the retired senior citizen abroad. However the U.S. Government makes generous provision for cost-of-living adjustments in the compensation of Government employees abroad. And, the Congress recently provided for cost-of-living tables to apply to overseas Americans for deductions from overseas earned income. It would appear that both of these precedents accept the necessity for taking account of differences in conditions abroad, and both offer indices that could easily be adapted to the Social Security benefit calculations.

ACA's renewed question: Why is the United States not more concerned with the plight of its overseas senior citizens? With several overseas cost-of-living indices already in use for Americans abroad, both in the Government employee sector and in the private citizen sector, why not adapt the Social Security benefits to reflect this already accepted reality? We appeal for a new consideration of this problem and for greater compassion for overseas senior citizens. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1980, I was absent for the last vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 112: H.R. 5548, gold medal to Simon Wiesenthal, the House passed the measure, amended, to authorize the President of the United States to present on behalf of the Congress a specially struck gold medal to Simon Wiesenthal, "yes." ●

**FRANK AND JOSEPHINE
DUVENECK**

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, there are only a handful of living individuals of whom I can say that they have been a beneficial inspiration to thousands of people in California and particularly to myself.

Two of those individuals, Frank Duveneck and his wife, the late Josephine Duveneck, stand alone in the minds of their neighbors, friends, and indeed the entire community of the southern San Francisco Peninsula.

The Duvenecks established California's first youth hostel at their ranch in the foothills of the Coast Range many years ago. They have been active in civil rights, interracial, environmental, educational, and peace causes during their entire lives.

At 93, Frank Duveneck was recently honored at a luncheon in Palo Alto. It is an honor to place the report of that luncheon in the permanent RECORD of the U.S. Congress. Frank and Jose-

phine Duveneck have represented the very best any of us can ever hope to achieve in these honored halls.

The article follows:

PALO ALTO—Frank Duveneck, the snow-haired "Johnny Appleseed of love," who has worked unstintingly for human rights and the conservation of nature, was honored with a testimonial banquet here Friday.

A native of Massachusetts, the 93-year old Duveneck and his late wife, Josephine, founded the first youth hostel in the state at their Hidden Villa Ranch in Los Altos Hills. They established interracial camps at the ranch and opened the wooded property to countless youth and community groups over the years.

Shortly before Mrs. Duveneck's death in 1978, the couple donated more than 400 acres of the ranch to the Midpeninsula Open Space District. The Duvenecks were founding members of the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club, now one of the largest chapters in the country.

Cupertino City Councilman Jim Jackson, the principal speaker at the luncheon, said he regretted that the occasion could not have been held on Valentine's Day.

"You've done so much living and given so much love in 93 years, I'm sorry we couldn't have this on Valentine's Day. But we'll make this 'Love for Frank Duveneck Day,'" Jackson said.

Employing a metaphor to describe Duveneck's myriad contributions, Jackson said products of the "Frank Duveneck love tree," can be seen throughout the Peninsula.

He said the love tree had sprouted at the ranch, but that its leaves could be seen at Tanforan in San Mateo County, a "way-station" for Japanese-Americans going to internment camps during World War II. At Tanforan, Duveneck comforted many of his Japanese-American friends and helped secure their personal belongings, Jackson said.

Duveneck's presence also could be detected at Peninsula School in Menlo Park, where he taught for a number of years, Jackson said.

"You've planted the seeds of love all over this area," Jackson said. "You are a veritable Johnny Appleseed of love."

After a rousing standing ovation, Duveneck spoke briefly about his work for the Democratic Party after initially being enamored of Republican Teddy Roosevelt.

He stressed that the recognition given him should be shared with his late wife.

"She was the spark plug," he said.

Following his remarks, the gathered friends and admirers sang a round of auld lang syne.

The luncheon was sponsored by several organizations, including the Los Altos Mountain View Democratic Club, the Palo Alto Democratic Club, the Committee for Green Foothills, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, the Peninsula Conservation Center, the Sempervirens Fund and the Century Club of Santa Clara County. ●

**CONDEMNING U.S. VOTE FOR U.N.
SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEM-
NATION OF ISRAEL**

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in strongly condemning the U.S. vote in favor of the

U.N. Security Council resolution calling on Israel to dismantle its settlements in the West Bank and Jerusalem. This one-sided, unbalanced resolution can only serve to lessen the prospects for peace in the Middle East. The U.S. vote in support of this resolution is shameful.

It is not surprising that the Security Council should offer an anti-Israel resolution. What is surprising and reprehensible is that our Government should line up with the enemies of Israel in attacking all of Israel's settlement policies, even in her own capital, Jerusalem.

The administration is now seeking to portray its carefully calculated policy decision as a mistake. It was a mistake—a mistake in judgment. The administration must know that the Congress will simply not tolerate any move to turn our back on Israel, the only democracy, the most stable Government and our one true friend and ally in the Persian Gulf.●

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE HARLEY STAGGERS

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1980

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of West Virginia's Second Congressional District have been very fortunate for the last 32 years. They have had their interests skillfully represented with the greatest devotion by their Representative to the U.S. House of Representatives, HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

During my first term in Congress in 1962 and 1963, I had the privilege of serving with HARLEY on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. That fine experience gave me a firsthand knowledge of his effective leadership and determined representation for his constituents and for the Nation. He is a forceful, hard-working legislator with an impressive array of accomplishments. His work has had a profound impact upon public health, transportation, communications, energy, consumer protection, and the environment.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been an outstanding Congressman. He is a statesman and a leader and a friend, and we will miss him.●

NUTRITION LABELING

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, this week in a commendable spirit of cooperation the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Federal Trade Com-

mission are jointly holding public hearings of food labeling reform.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, I believe it is essential that consumers have access to unbiased, scientifically sound, and useful information about the foods they purchase.

Today it was my pleasure to testify before a distinguished panel composed of Commissioner Goyen of the Food and Drug Administration, Assistance Secretary Foreman of USDA and Mr. Thomas Donegan of the Federal Trade Commission and I wish to share my remarks with my distinguished colleagues:

Ladies and gentlemen of the panel, once more I come before you to present the consumers' case for comprehensive and useful nutrition labeling. Eighteen long months ago I applauded you for your initiative. Today I urge you to complete the task to which you have devoted so much dedication and energy.

For how long shall consumers bear the burden of bureaucratic temporizing? The Surgeon General in his recent report "Healthy People" warns that:

"Although evidence keeps mounting that certain food factors and current dietary habits may be linked with health problems as diverse as heart disease, tooth decay, obesity and some types of cancer, consumers often find it difficult to make informed choices about food."

While I must commend the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission for making progress in the past two years to develop recommendations to improve nutrition labeling, I must conclude that outmoded federal regulations are in fact hindrances to consumer knowledge about the food they purchase.

I am particularly upset that after amassing thousands of pages of testimony, conducting costly surveys, and publishing weighty notices and summaries, the three agencies represented here today have not yet formulated positions on two issues vital to nutrition labeling:

The information to be required on nutrition labels; and

The format for nutrition labeling.

As Chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition, I am particularly concerned that consumers have available the type of information which will allow them to choose a healthy diet for themselves and their families. In the course of hearings before my Subcommittee, Members have been told repeatedly by consumers that they are simply unable to make use of nutrition labels as they are currently constituted.

At joint hearings held on the usefulness of including the recommended dietary allowances on the nutrition label, there was impressive agreement among scientists, consumer representatives, Government officials, and educators that consumers are not able to translate RDA's into personally useful dietary information. Yet a major portion of the current nutrition label is taken up with percentages of the RDA's for macronutrients. Thiamine and Riboflavin may have particular meaning to nutritionists and dietitians, but most of us think of meal planning in terms of foods, not nutrients. Serving sizes expressed in ounces, carbohydrates expressed in grams, macronutrients expressed in percentages of RDA's, speak more to mathematicians than to harried

shoppers trying to provide maximum nutrition at reasonable costs for their families.

I would hope that your final recommendations on the information to be presented on the nutrition label would require a declaration by serving:

The number of calories,

The percentage of carbohydrates, fat and cholesterol, and

The amount of sodium and sugar both occurring naturally and added in processing.

In the recently released popular pamphlet, "Dietary Guidelines for Americans," consumers are advised to avoid too much salt and sugar and read nutrition labels for clues of their presence in processed foods.

Ladies and Gentlemen, must consumers become sleuths in the supermarket, looking for hidden clues about the nutritional composition of the food they are purchasing? While some credit is due to those processors who voluntarily provide consumers with comprehensible information about salt, fats, cholesterol and sugar, it is nevertheless dismaying to note that if cats or dogs could read labels they would know more about the nutritional content of the food they eat than the average American can deduce about his or her food.

This box of "cat chow" provides a detailed listing of all basic ingredients and vitamin supplements, as well as an analysis of the protein, fat, fiber and salt content clearly expressed in percentages of the whole. I would also commend the processor in this case for designing a format that is simple, direct and readable.

Whatever information is required on the nutrition label must be presented in a format that will be readily comprehensible to the broadest base of American consumers. This means the elderly and the young; the educated and the barely literate. Such a widely differentiated audience is a challenge especially for a bureaucracy, but I would urge you and your communications staff to consult with the advertising industry. Obviously American business enterprises have been successfully able to convey information about their products to the public.

As one who has long advocated graphic labeling, I am heartened that such a system was preferred by a majority of respondents in your consumer poll. I strongly believe that color-coded graphic labels consistent from product to product will enable consumers to make not only sound judgments about the nutritional content of a product but also make valid comparisons with other products. Such a comprehensive system is easier said than devised, but if the public and private sectors combine their talents a number of workable alternatives would soon be available.

In addition to commenting on the content and format of nutrition labeling, I would remind this panel that such devices are no more than tools to be used by an alert and informed consumer. Without proper nutrition education, these tools, however skillfully designed, will only add to the confusion and misinformation already in the marketplace.

One reason why the current labeling procedure has not been accepted by the public has been the failure of the agencies you represent to mount an aggressive educational campaign.

Three years ago I proposed that your agencies jointly participate in a Nutrition Education Council. This panel and its work is an important first step in fulfilling my call for interagency cooperation. I urge you to continue this cooperative venture when your final proposals have been completed by directing your efforts toward a national nutrition education campaign embodying

the principles of the Surgeon General's report and the Dietary Guidelines.

If well designed posters and pamphlets were made available to shoppers at retail food outlets clearly explaining the components of the nutrition label, consumers would be better able to benefit from the improvements we are discussing here today.

Finally, Congress itself is acting to meet the challenge of improved labeling. Senator McGovern and I have jointly introduced S. 1651 and H.R. 5137 as companion bills. A key provision of these bills is the compilation of a nutritional data bank. Such an informational bank would free both large and small producers and processors from the economic and regulatory burdens that have hampered cooperation in the past. This nutritional data base will also insure that consumers will be provided with accurate information about all the food choices which confront them in the marketplace.

As Chairmen of the Subcommittees of jurisdiction over these bills, Senator McGovern and I intend to hold hearings and actively work for their passage by the House and Senate. Joining us in our efforts will be the Senate and House Commerce Committees which also have an important role to play in achieving the goal of labeling reform.

Just as we have come here today, my Congressional colleagues and I hope that we can depend on your expertise and support as we travel the long and probably difficult legislative road before us.

Thank you.●

ANTHONY J. RICCIO

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland, Ohio, has lost one of its finest citizens and community members with the sudden death this past Sunday, March 2, of Anthony "Tony" J. Riccio. Mere words cannot express the sense of shock or depth of sorrow felt by Tony Riccio's family and friends over his untimely passing. I share personally in their anguish and grief, for Tony Riccio was a special sort of man whose life shone with love and sacrifice and whose work inspired others to learn dedication and commitment. In this hard hour of sorrow, there is some comfort in reflecting on Tony Riccio's life and work which have set an imperishable example for all of us to follow.

At the time of his death, Tony Riccio was employed as area manager of the eastern Cleveland postal service and had served 33 years in the U.S. Postal Service. Tony made the proverbial climb through the postal ranks from mail carrier in 1947 to area manager in 1977, during which time he also served as union counselor for Local 52 of the Firemen and Oilers Union. From 1972 to 1975, he held a seat on the executive board of the Cleveland AFL-CIO Community Service Board. He was truly a dedicated career government employee.

Tony Riccio graduated from West High School and attended Western Reserve University in Cleveland, at

which time he joined the U.S. 10th Army in World War II and served for 27 months in the Pacific, where he experienced some of the fiercest fighting of the war on Okinawa. After World War II, Tony remained active in the Army Reserves for 36 years, holding the rank of chief warrant officer. Also, Tony was an active member of the American Legion Post 610 and of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 84 where he served as commander from 1962 to 1965.

Tony's commitment to public service carried over to his community and church activities. He served on the executive board of Cleveland's West Side Service Council and played an energetic role in Cleveland's Ward 3 Democratic Club. As an Italian American proud of his ancestors' roots in Italian history and culture, he participated with typical enthusiasm in the Sons of Italy and the Italian-American Brotherhood. Tony's deeply held religious beliefs resulted in his long membership in the Knights of Columbus and in the Holy Name Society of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church on Cleveland's west side.

As part of his versatile interest in and enthusiasm for public and personal activities, Tony Riccio developed a skill in the subject of graphology—the study of handwriting—and published several articles on the subject. He also published articles in various union magazines.

Another aspect of his life was his love and commitment to his wife Fanny and his three sons. They served as a model family to all who knew them. Tony took a personal interest in his sons' activities and was always proud and supportive of his wife's community involvement.

All of us will miss his kindness, his wit and his advice, but the memory of Tony Riccio will always live on.●

MRS. ZEONA ESTELLE HALEY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in our attempt to recognize individuals who influence and contribute to our country, we often neglect to pay tribute to those who have influenced our leaders. Today, I would like my colleagues to join me in saluting one such individual, Mrs. Zeona Estelle Haley.

As the stepmother of the author of "Roots," we can clearly identify the pride and strength that Mrs. Haley instilled in her children. Certainly we must recognize Mrs. Haley for the encouragement, support, and direction that she provided them.

Mrs. Haley, however, is a source of pride in her own right. A graduate of the Ohio State University, Mrs. Haley earned a professorship at the West Virginia State College in teacher train-

ing. During her 40 years of service in education, Mrs. Haley's strength, dignity, and determination provided inspiration and guidance for thousands of students.

I am, Mr. Speaker, both proud and pleased to salute this honorable woman for her strength, inspiration, and commitment to the young people of this country.●

CALIFORNIA VEGETABLE GROWERS—UNDISPUTED LEADERSHIP

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to my colleagues from the great State of New York. A Sunday New York Times article earlier this month reported that the Empire State had pulled ahead of Arizona in the race for fourth place in the production of fresh market vegetables for the season ending in 1979. The top position was garnered by my home State of California followed by Florida and Texas.

It is commendable that our friends in the Northeast contributed 4.7 percent of the Nation's vegetable output last year, with cabbage being the leading crop. But in the processed vegetable category, they were a distant seventh behind top-ranked California.

New York—congratulations on your recent achievement, but California still produced 10 times that amount, leading all States in the production of both fresh and processed vegetables, with a whopping 44.1 percent contribution to the Nation's 1979 output of fresh market vegetables, a clear front-runner and undisputed leader in this area.

Of the top 30 leading agricultural counties in California, I am happy to report that of those located within the 15th District, Fresno stands at No. 1, Stanislaus at No. 6, Merced at No. 9, and Madera at No. 15.

Apart from vegetables, California also produces the greatest variety of fresh fruits, grains, meats, and poultry available anywhere in the world.

I am proud to represent the No. 1 agricultural district in the No. 1 ranked agricultural State in the Union. New York, stick to apparel, because when it comes to the title in agriculture, California will never give up the contest.●

AGRICULTURAL RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1980

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my distin-

guished colleagues, Mr. BEDELL of Iowa and Mr. ALEXANDER of Arkansas in introducing the Agricultural Renewable Energy Development and Management Act of 1980.

The purpose of this legislation is to accelerate the development and production of renewable energy for direct application in our farm and rural environments by redefining and upgrading the renewable energy programs in the Department of Agriculture. In so doing, the legislation would provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Rural Energy Development in the Department of Agriculture who would be charged with the development and management of an energy self-sufficiency program for our Nation's agricultural and rural sectors. The program to be developed would have as one of its major goals the achievement of a 50-percent reduction in oil use by our rural sector by the year 2000. Beyond that, I envision this proposal as providing the administrative framework for the programs which will make up title 2 of the omnibus energy bill, also known as the synfuels bill, now in conference.

This title dealing with agricultural, forestry, and rural energy development provides a series of direct loans, loan guarantees, grants, research, and extension training for a variety of onfarm and rural energy demonstrations. I believe that the legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today will provide a significant new focus within the Department of Agriculture for the administration of these new programs, and will establish within the Department a highly visible point of contact for State and local agricultural sector energy initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural commodities and forest products are receiving increasing attention as alternative sources of energy because they are renewable and available in significant quantities in the United States. Through the omnibus energy bill title on agriculture, forestry, and rural energy, the Government is making a clear commitment to the development of a significant industry which will produce energy from agricultural commodities and wood products. The loan guarantees and grants provided in that legislation will spur farmers, farm cooperatives, and industry to construct alternative energy production projects. A cooperative effort between Government and industry will pay big dividends in helping reduce this Nation's excessive dependence on foreign sources of energy.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we propose today will elevate the status of renewable energy planning and coordination within the Department of Agriculture and will lay the groundwork for the establishment of a program aimed at promoting energy self-sufficiency in our Nation's agricultural and rural sectors. Through title 2 of the omnibus energy bill, the funding for this type of program will be made available. Through our legislation, the

administrative framework and the planning for, and the unswerving national commitment to agricultural sector energy self-sufficiency will be put firmly in place.●

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND BALANCED GROWTH ACT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, chairman of the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, recently spoke in this Chamber of the President's 1980 Economic Report. Congressman HAWKINS charged that the report violated both the letter and the spirit of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978. I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

The Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act directs the President to establish yearly numerical goals to "achieve as rapidly as possible the goals of full employment and production," and "interim targets of 4 percent unemployment and 3 percent inflation by 1983." Further, the act states that the President may recommend modification of this timetable, and that the Congress, if the Members so choose, may act upon these recommendations.

Although, as the law reads, the President may only present recommendations, he states in his 1980 economic report that the goals of the legislation cannot and in fact will not be met in the time provided by law. He states that by using the authority provided for him by the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, he will extend the unemployment goal to 1985, and postpone the objective of a lowered inflation rate of 3 percent until 1988. These are not recommendations, but an arrogation by the President of powers specifically delegated by law to the Congress. The mandate and intent of this legislation cannot be more clear. The committee report attached to the bill states that the bill provides for "review by the Congress of the recommendations which the President transmits to the Congress, and also provides for alterations by the Congress of the programs and policies submitted to it."

A unilateral decision to abrogate the law cannot be tolerated by the Congress. It is now our responsibility to reject this administration's blatant violation of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.

And we must take action now, when the unemployment rate is at 6.2 percent nationwide, and projected by this administration to rise to 7.4 percent this year. We cannot continue to ignore the real financial and human costs of continued high and increasing

unemployment. It is estimated that for every 1 percent rise in the unemployment rate, the Federal Government expends \$15 billion to \$20 billion in welfare programs, unemployment compensation, mental health programs, and so on.

I call upon the Joint Economic and the Budget Committees, which are so entrusted by the act, to recognize the social, fiscal, and legal implications of the administration's actions. I hope that we can work together to provide alternative measures so that the mandate of the law can be met.●

EAST TIMOR CRIES FOR HELP

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention this editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor describing the plight of the people of East Timor. Frequent references have suggested the situation is as bad as Biafra and Kampuchea. The numbers are uncertain but it appears that more than 100,000 inhabitants of the island with a population of 600,000 have died. As the editorial describes, the deaths can be attributed to a war in the country which began in 1975 and continues today. The consequences of the war, which we have all become so familiar with in Cambodia, are prevalent in East Timor. These include fighting, disease, and starvation, exacerbated by the fact that thousands of refugees in appalling conditions are being forced into resettlement camps.

Recent accounts from refugees who just left the island indicate the situation is getting worse, not better. Apparently, those being detained in resettlement camps are not even allowed to farm the land. The medical situation is desperate. It seems that a majority of the population is infected with malaria, and diseases associated with malnutrition are becoming rampant.

As you can see, this is a desperate situation requiring our attention. I urge my colleagues to review the following editorial detailing the situation:

EAST TIMOR'S AGONY RIVALS THAT OF CAMBODIA

(By Daniel Southerland)

In many ways the plight of East Timor rivals that of Cambodia.

This was acknowledged by no less a person than Indonesia's Foreign Minister, who stated that conditions of starvation on the island of Timor might even be worse than those suffered by the people of Biafra in the late 1960s and later by the people of Cambodia.

But Cambodia, where more than 2 million people out of a population of 4 to 5 million may be facing starvation, is big news these days compared with smaller-scale East Timor, where more than 200,000 people—or an equally large proportion of the total pop-

ulation—suffer from what is described as acute malnutrition.

Indeed, few people have ever even heard of the mountainous, crocodile-shaped island of Timor, located at the eastern end of the Indonesian archipelago and measuring only 60 miles across at its widest point. When U.S. congressmen met here Dec. 4 for the fourth congressional hearing on East Timor since 1977, the event scarcely merited mention by most American news organizations.

But the few specialists who try to watch developments on the eastern half of the island, a former Portuguese colony which was invaded by Indonesia four years ago, consider it to be a potentially hot issue for the United States, for America's West European allies, and for Australia, which is located only 350 miles to the southeast of Timor.

This is because of Indonesia's close ties with the West, the brutal nature of Indonesia's attack against East Timor, and the subsequent way in which most Western nations seem to have overlooked Indonesia's actions, despite condemnation by most of the international community.

The Indonesians used American weapons in their takeover of East Timor. They are recipients of much American economic and military aid. Successive administrations in Washington have considered Indonesia important because of its status as a staunchly anticommunist, oil-producing nation with the fifth largest population in the world.

The Indonesian government has blamed the famine in East Timor on hardships allegedly caused by Fretilin, the Timorese independence movement. The U.S. has tended to point to a combination of factors—war, drought, and other climatic and geographical conditions—as the cause of malnutrition. But a number of witnesses from the island itself have blamed the Indonesian invasion and occupation of the island, which, some of them say, included a deliberate policy of denying food to civilians who were associated in any way with the Timorese liberation movement.

The question before the hearing convened here Dec. 4 by Rep. Lester A. Wolff (D) of New York, chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives, was how to facilitate current American-supported relief efforts in East Timor.

U.S. officials declared at the hearing that there has been a marked improvement in the situation in East Timor in recent weeks. Other witnesses, including Rep. Tom Harkin (D) of Iowa, expressed doubt, however, that enough is being done in what is still an emergency situation under which at least half of the former colony's people have fled or been forced away from their original homes.

Armando Sonagere, regional director of the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) the major outlet for American aid to East Timor, quoted the CRS program director in the area as saying that the malnutrition there was the worst he had encountered in 14 years' experience.

Because of Indonesian sensitivities on all issues related to East Timor, the three witnesses for the US State Department were careful, however, not to speak of "starvation." They, in fact, outdid themselves in producing euphemisms to spare the feelings of the Indonesians. In State Department language, for instance, the Indonesian invasion and takeover of East Timor has become its "incorporation."

Representative Wolff tried to set the tone at the outset by insisting that the highest priority for the hearing was dealing with the immediate needs of East Timor and not dwelling on the past. The congressman, and

the State Department witnesses, gave the impression that if too much criticism of Indonesia emerged from the hearing, it might cause the Indonesians to restrict future aid projects.

But Mr. Harkin and Bruce P. Cameron, representative of the Americans for Democratic Action, insisted that the past had relevance for the future. They contended that, given Indonesia's earlier record in Timor, there was a need for increased monitoring by outside observers of the distribution of aid. They also questioned State Department assertions that a major reason for famine and the movement of tens of thousands of Timorese away from their homes in the mountains was erosion and "deforestation" caused by the slash-and-burn farming which is traditional on the island.

Mr. Harkin cited news reports, letters smuggled out of the island, and reports of church and aid officials in Portugal and Australia as indicating that Indonesian actions were the root cause of famine in East Timor.

Mr. Sonagere of CRS contended that his agency now is able to move unrestricted throughout the island, whose population includes a large number of Roman Catholics. Thanks to 90 field workers from CRS, the food is getting through to the people, he said.

There was at least one skeptic in the audience watching this hearing, however. He was a dignified, moustachioed, gray-haired priest named Leoneto do Rego, a veteran of 23 years' experience in East Timor. He left there last June, because, as he put it: "It was a wartime situation. . . I couldn't carry out my activities as a priest."

Fr. Leoneto said that a brief period of peace had preceded the Indonesian invasion on Dec. 7, 1975. The FRETELIN movement was in control then, he said.

As the priest described it, the Indonesians attacked relentlessly with infantry and with US-supplied, armed reconnaissance planes known as the OV-10 (Bronco). They concentrated people around the villages and resettlement centers. They stole at least part of the relief food and sold it.

Fr. Leoneto would have been glad to testify before the US congressmen. He was not invited to do so. It might have offended the Indonesians, and it would, of course, have revived disputes about what happened in the past.

DANNY CORBETT, BUENA PARK BOYS' CLUB "BOY OF THE YEAR"

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, during the course of our lifetime there are some honors that we earn which do much to shape our character and mark our course for the future. Participation in programs, such as the Boys' Club of America, reinforces these characteristics which we seek in responsible citizens and provides opportunities for leadership potential to be nurtured and developed.

Occasionally, within these programs, an individual will exceed the standards

set by the organization, whose personal drive and commitment stands above the other members of the group. Such a person is Danny Corbett and for this reason he has been singled out this year for the "Boy of the Year" award of the Buena Park Boys' Club.

Words such as courtesy, understanding, and ambition can only begin to describe this young man. He has been active in all segments of the boys' club and this year has been particularly active as editor of the boys' club newspaper and as one of the first junior tutors.

Danny has earned the respect and admiration of his club because of his dedication to the goals of the club and his personal commitment to the other members of the organization. He has provided a positive example and impressed those who lead the program. Danny Corbett is a young man who is highly recommended and in our opinion very much entitled to this award.

NUCLEAR ENERGY AND OIL IMPORTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, confusion has always accompanied claims made in favor of the expanded use of nuclear in the Nation's utilities. In the early 1960's, atomic power advocates promised "electricity too cheap to meter." Now that oil imports provide the central focus for our energy questions, nuclear supporters proclaim atomic generating capacity as critical in replacing oil. It is once more necessary to counter the nuclear industry's claims.

Mr. George L. Weil, former Assistant Director of the Atomic Energy Commission's Reactor Development Division, recently addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times on the oil-nuclear question. In it, he refutes assertions made by President Carter and the Atomic Industrial Forum with respect to the replacement of oil by nuclear utilities. Mr. Weil addresses the simple point that most nuclear plants displace domestic coal, not imported oil.

Figures developed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission show 1979 nuclear generation offsetting 80 to 87 million barrels per year of oil. This is a far cry from the 884 million barrels per year suggested by the President, and is also far removed from the 548 million-barrel-per-year figure cited by the Atomic Industrial Forum.

Nuclear, then, contributed to the slower than expected growth in the development of domestic coal reserves while displacing about the same amount of oil as would have been conserved with a 3-percent decline in gasoline consumption.

In making the critical energy decisions we must address, it is important

to have accurate information. I commend Mr. Weil's excellent letter to my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1980]
NUCLEAR POWER'S INFLATED IMAGE AS AN OIL
SAVER

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 25, 1980.

To the Editor:

The importance of the nuclear issue in the Presidential campaign is highlighted in Leslie Bennett's Feb. 15 report from New Hampshire, in which reference is made to a statement by President Carter that "each nuclear plant eliminates the need to import 13 million barrels of oil annually."

Since 68 plants had commercial operating licenses during all of 1979, Mr. Carter's figure translates into an oil savings of 884 million barrels of oil a year.

On Jan. 9, at a meeting with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Roger J. Sherman, chairman of the Atomic Industrial Forum, states: "The nuclear reactor presently licensed to operate . . . supply the nation with electricity that otherwise would require burning 1.5 million barrels of oil a day." That translates into 548 million barrels a year.

Thus, Mr. Carter's total exceeds that of Mr. Sherman by 60 percent. This disparity can be explained on the basis of their differing assumptions and is of minor importance compared with a basic erroneous assumption made by both Mr. Carter and Mr. Sherman, which significantly distorts the relationship between the operation of nuclear plants and oil saved. This relationship is important to those who plan our energy policies and to the public, which must judge these policies. Both are being grossly misled.

Implicit in the figures of Messrs. Carter and Sherman is the assumption that all nuclear plants displace oil. However, utilities operating nuclear plants in the heart of coal country are more likely to be displacing coal. In other locations, the fossil fuel options may be broader, i.e., oil, coal or gas.

An analysis based on information obtained directly from utilities and on statistics from the most recent Nuclear Regulatory Commission's monthly report (January through November 1979) shows that nuclear plants definitely displaced 80 million barrels of oil during this period, so during all of 1979, the total was probably 87 million, and not Mr. Carter's 884 million or Mr. Sherman's 548 million. Sixty-one percent of the electricity generated by nuclear plants definitely displaced coal, 20 percent definitely displaced oil and 19 percent displaced oil, coal or gas.

In other words, in 1979 American nuclear plants that clearly displace oil saved as much oil as Americans could have saved if they had consumed about 3 percent less gasoline.

George L. Weil.●

GASOLINE ALLOCATION

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution calling upon the Department of Energy to take action to minimize some of the extremely adverse impacts of its gasoline allocation regulations on small independent service station operators. The resolution calls for

DOE to impose a moratorium on gasoline allocations to new stations where such allocations would hurt existing independent operators. The resolution also calls for DOE to completely revise its regulations for increased simplicity and flexibility and it calls on DOE to submit a plan to Congress for eliminating its unacceptable backlog of allocation and appeal cases and for processing future cases in a timely manner.

There is significant evidence that DOE's gasoline regulations are the cause of unnecessary market disruption and many believe last summer's gasoline lines were caused in part by these regulations. The inflexibility of the regulations prevented gasoline supplies from being redistributed for areas of surplus to areas of shortage.

DOE allocation regulations clearly favor allocating gasoline to new gasoline stations over increasing allocations for small, independent operators already in business. A person desiring to establish a new gasoline station will normally be granted an allocation if he can show that he has a willing supplier. On the other hand, an existing station must demonstrate serious economic hardship in order to successfully petition for an increase in allocation. The result of these quite different standards is that scarce gasoline is being allocated to new stations at the expense of existing small, independent retailers. For example, while existing dealers wait months, and often in vain, for DOE to act on their requests for increased allocations of a few thousand gallons, a new truckstop on a secondary road with two gasoline pumps recently got an entitlement of 2,250,000 gallons a year. A relocated station near a town of 3,000 inhabitants—with existing station in the same area doing 120,000 to 180,000 gallons a year—got an entitlement for 1,072,000 gallons. The result of this two-standard policy is that independent gasoline retailers are going out of business in alarming numbers.

In the last year, 17,000 independent gasoline retailers—fully 10 percent of the Nation's total—left the marketplace. At the same time, refiner-operated outlets have increased their share of the market from 12.7 to 25.8 percent over the past 8 years. The continued shift from independent operators to refiner-owned stations will result in irreparable damage to the structure of competition in the gasoline industry.

In addition to the bias of the DOE regulations toward new stations and its drastic effect on independent operators, the extremely complex regulations result in the average small businessman being completely at a loss as to his rights and responsibilities under the regulations. In order to apply for an increased allocation, retailers must complete extensive forms. After receipt of the application, DOE often must go back to the applicant for additional information. To file an appeal to a DOE decision is so complicated as

to often require the hiring of an attorney. The complexity of the regulations has also contributed to the over 10,000 gasoline allocation and appeals case backlog in DOE. One simple way that the regulations could be simplified to help this situation is to remove all very small operators, say 20,000 gallons a month, from the allocation fraction process.

While this resolution is addressed to a problem immediately impacting several thousand small, independent retailers, the problem also impacts all consumers of gasoline. History teaches us that where competition is decreased—especially in a light supply situation—prices increase and the quality of service tends to deteriorate. Surely, we do not need the Federal Government regulatory process unnecessarily contributing to a lessening of competition and increased prices in the gasoline industry.

I urge my colleagues to join me in helping to minimize the adverse impact of Department of Energy allocation regulations on small, independent service station operators by supporting this resolution.●

RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO
RICO'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
IN REGARD TO
THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON
NAVY PERSONNEL THE PAST
DECEMBER 3, 1979, IN PUERTO
RICO

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a resolution approved by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's House of Representatives, expressing the repudiation by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico, for the vicious and cowardly act of terrorism perpetrated against personnel of the Navy of the United States of America on Monday, December 3, 1979, in the vicinity of Sabana Seca Naval Station in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

The resolution follows:

I, Cristino Bernazard, Secretary of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify: That the House of Representatives in its Session of February 13, 1980, approved H.R. No. 719, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

To express the repudiation by the House of Representatives on behalf of the People of Puerto Rico, for the vicious and cowardly act of terrorism perpetrated against personnel of the Navy of the United States of America on Monday, December 3, 1979, in the vicinity of the Sabana Seca Naval Station in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

On Monday, December 3, 1979, the People of Puerto Rico were consternated by the

news that a terrorist attack had been perpetrated in the vicinity of the Sabana Seca Naval Station in Toa Baja, against a United States Navy bus which transported eighteen persons. Two of them were killed and ten others were wounded. These people were unarmed and completely defenseless when they were ambushed as they were going peacefully to their place of work.

Ballistic experts have determined that all the weapons used were extremely destructive, among which there were rifles used in the Vietnam War, some were manufactured in the United States and others in China or Czechoslovakia.

Not content with the crime committed, the murderers have tried to justify it, by calling themselves "patriots". A patriot is one who loves his country and tries to do well by it; patriots are those members of our labor force who work unceasingly from day to day so that this beautiful land may enjoy the freedoms that human beings are entitled to; patriots are our "jibaros" who, from sunrise to sunset, till the land on which they rest their hopes for a future that is seen to be better each day. A person who viciously attacks his brothers and brings suffering and tears to humanity; he who respects only his own ideas without any respect for the ideals and rights of others, can not use his patriotism to justify his misdeeds.

This irresponsible, repugnant, irrational and cowardly attack is a reproachable act which deserves to be, and is repudiated by all the People of Puerto Rico as being contrary to our idiosyncrasy, and which does not reflect our true feelings. The use of violence has never been the means of expression of the vast majority of the Puerto Rican People, who have traditionally used the democratic process as a means of expression and a way of solving its problems.

The House of Representatives of Puerto Rico on behalf of the People of Puerto Rico, condemns and repudiates this vicious act of terrorism committed by the enemies of this People. This Body expresses its condolence to the bereaved relatives of the victims and prays for the prompt recovery of the wounded.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

SECTION 1.—The House of Representatives on behalf of the People of Puerto Rico, expresses its repudiation of and indignation for the vicious and cowardly act of terrorism perpetrated against personnel of the Navy of the United States of America on Monday, December 3, 1979, in the vicinity of the Sabana Seca Naval Station in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

SECTION 2.—A copy of this Resolution duly translated into the English language, shall be sent to the Honorable Jimmy Carter, President of the United States; the Honorable Baltasar Corrada del Río, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico at Washington; the Honorable Carlos Romero Barceló, Governor of Puerto Rico; Admiral Arthur J. Knozen, Commander of the Naval Forces of the United States of America in the Caribbean; the relatives of the victims, and to the news media of Puerto Rico for their information and publication.

And for transmittal to Hon. Baltasar Corrada del Río, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, I issue this certificate in my Office at the Capitol Building in San Juan, Puerto Rico and set my hand and affix the seal of the House of Representatives hereon, this twentieth day of February of the year nineteen hundred eighty.

CRISTINO BERNABARD,
Secretary of the
House of Representatives.●

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

HON. DOUGLAS APPELATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, the showy and expensive political spectacle before the American people called the Presidential primaries is the best example of why this Nation needs a national Presidential primary. There are many reasons for this: over-exposure of the candidates, physical wear and tear on the candidates, and far too much garbled political rhetoric for 12 or so months. But, even more important, a national Presidential primary will put the selection of a Presidential nominee in the hands of the members of each political party and take it out of the hands of a small group of political bosses who can control delegates at the national convention.

In order to point to this lunacy, I would like to point to a recent article by the author, T. H. White, that appeared in the February 1980, issue of Life. In that article, Mr. White indicated that the number of primary elections will rise to 35 in 1980, which lends itself to realizing the inequities in the system as well as the unfortunate influence early primaries have on later ones.

Mr. Speaker, as a remedy to this complicated procedure, I invite my colleagues to cosponsor my bill, H.R. 1904, which calls for a direct Presidential primary where there would be a single primary with the nomination of a party's candidate coming directly from the voting population rather than from a selected group of delegates.●

TIPS ON HOW TO AVOID OVER-PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX BY OLDER AMERICANS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in my position as chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, I am constantly reminded of the economic problems that many older Americans face due to limited fixed incomes. When one considers the vast number of older Americans who are overpaying their income taxes, because of a failure to take advantage of legal tax reduction mechanisms, one feels compelled to act to minimize this problem.

There are several important tax relief measures which took effect beginning with the 1979 tax year. It is impossible, however, for individuals of any age to take advantage of these provisions and obtain tax relief, unless they are aware of the changes. Without this knowledge, older Americans would be losing much needed additional income.

In past years, our House Aging Committee has made available an annual checklist of itemized deductions prepared by the Senate Special Committee on Aging to aid elderly taxpayers in completing their income tax forms. We are deeply grateful to the Joint Committee on Taxation for reviewing last year's checklist and suggesting needed changes to reflect changes in the tax code.

I commend the Joint Committee on Taxation for its assistance this year and the Senate Special Committee on Aging for its effort and submit the revised summary here for the benefit of all who may read it:

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

(A Revised Checklist of Itemized Deductions for Use in Taxable Year 1979).

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

Medical and dental expenses

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Insurance premiums

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3 percent rule.

Drugs and medicines

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3 percent rule) but only to extent exceeding 1 percent of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Other medical expenses

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3 percent limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor). Acupuncture services. Ambulance hire. Anesthetist. Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor). Artificial limbs and teeth. Back supports (prescribed by a doctor). Braces.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.

Cardiographs. Chiroprapist. Chiropractor. Christian Science practitioner, authorized. Convalescent home (for medical treatment only). Crutches. Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth). Dentures. Dermatologist. Eyeglasses.

Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).

Gynecologist. Hearing aids and batteries. Home health services. Hospital expenses. Insulin treatment. Invalid chair. Lab tests. Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap). Neurologist.

Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you). Occupational therapist. Ophthalmologist. Optician. Optometrist. Oral surgery. Osteopath, licensed. Pediatrician. Physical examinations. Physical therapist. Physician. Podiatrist. Psychiatrists. Psychoanalyst. Psychologist. Psychotherapy.

Radium therapy. Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor). Seeing-eye dog and

maintenance. Speech therapist. Splints. Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare. Surgeon.

Telephone/teletype special communication equipment for the deaf.

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (8¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).

Vaccines. Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health). Wheelchairs. Whirlpool baths for medical purposes. X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your bank credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bank is repaid.

Taxes

Real estate. General sales. State and local income. Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

Contributions

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20% of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 8 cents per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

Interest

Home mortgage. Auto loan. Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual

percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge" expressed as an annual percentage rate.

Casualty or theft losses

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, you may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

Miscellaneous

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return.

Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by your employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for certain business purposes.

Political campaign contributions

You may claim a credit (line 38, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general, or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, or (4) local com-

mittee of a national political party. The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$50 ceiling (\$100 for couples filing jointly).

Presidential election campaign fund

Additionally, you may voluntarily earmark \$1 of your taxes (\$2 on joint returns) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

Additional information

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

Other tax relief measures

Filing status	Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—
Single (under age 65).....	\$3,300
Single (age 65 or older).....	4,300
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child.....	5,400
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child.....	6,400
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly.....	5,400
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly.....	6,400
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly.....	7,400
Married filing separately.....	2,700

Additional exemption for age

Besides the regular \$1,000 exemption, you are allowed an additional exemption of \$1,000 if you are age 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year. If both a husband and wife are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year, each is entitled to an additional exemption of \$1,000 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1980, you will be entitled to the additional \$1,000 exemption because of age for your 1979 Federal income tax return.

"Zero bracket amount"

The "zero bracket amount" is a flat amount that depends on your filing status. It is not a separate deduction; instead, the equivalent amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules. Since this amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules, you will need to make an adjustment if you itemize deductions. However, itemizers will not experience any change in their tax liability and the tax computation will be simplified for many itemizers.

Tax tables

Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct \$1,000 for each exemption because these amounts are also built into the tax table for you.

Multiple support agreements

In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$1,000 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of personal residence

You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale.

These requirements, and the amount of gain that may be excluded, differ depending on whether you sold your home before July 27, 1978, or on or after that date. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales before July 27, 1978, and only once for sales on or after that date.

If you sold your home before July 27, 1978, and you were age 65 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude the gain attributable to \$35,000 of the adjusted sales price if you owned and occupied the residence for 5 of the 8 years ending on the date of sale. If you sold the home after July 26, 1978, and you were age 55 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude \$100,000 of gain on the sale if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years under certain circumstances). Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, you may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale or your personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling or Purchasing Your Home) may also be helpful.

Credit for the elderly

You may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as \$375 (if single), or \$562.50 (if married filing jointly), if you are:

1. Age 65 or older, or
2. Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

Credit for child and dependent care expenses

Certain payments made for child and dependent care may be claimed as a credit against tax.

If you maintained a household that included your dependent child under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, you may be allowed a 20 percent credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable you to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions on Form 2441.

Earned income credit

If you maintain a household for a child who is under age 19, or is a student, or is a

disabled dependent, you may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to \$500. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if you reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040) of less than \$10,000, you may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, other employee compensation, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (line 13, Form 1040)). A married couple must file a joint return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

Energy tax act

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 is directed at providing tax incentives for energy conservation measures and for conversion to renewable energy sources.

A credit of up to \$300 may be claimed for expenditures for energy conservation property installed in or on your principal residence, whether you own or rent it. The residence must have been substantially completed by April 20, 1977. Items eligible for the credit are limited to the following: insulation (fiberglass, cellulose, etc.) for ceilings, walls, floors, roofs, water heaters, etc.; exterior storm (or thermal) windows or doors; caulking or weatherstripping for exterior windows or doors; a furnace replacement burner which reduces the amount of fuel used; a device to make flue openings (for a heating system) more efficient; an electrical or mechanical furnace ignition system which replaces a gas pilot light; an automatic energy-saving setback thermostat; and a meter which displays the cost of energy usage.

A maximum credit for renewable energy source property is \$2,200. Equipment used in the production or distribution of heat or electricity from solar, geothermal, or wind energy sources for residential heating, cooling, or other purposes may qualify for this credit.

Energy credits may be claimed by completing Form 5695 and attaching it to your Form 1040. Credit for expenditures made after April 19, 1977, and before January 1, 1979, must be claimed on your 1978 tax return. Do not file an amended 1977 return to claim a credit for expenditure in 1977.

Examples of items which do not qualify for energy credit are the following: carpeting, drapes, wood paneling, exterior siding, heat pump, wood or peat fueled residential equipment, fluorescent replacement lighting system, hydrogen fueled residential equipment, equipment using wind energy for transportation, expenditures for a swimming pool used as an energy storage medium, and greenhouses.

For further information, consult the instructions for Form 5695 and IRS Publication 903, Energy Credits for Individuals.

Capital gains deduction

The Revenue Act of 1979 increased from 50 to 60 percent the portion of a capital gain that may be deducted from gross income. For example, an individual selling stock or securities held for more than one year would be eligible to claim this deduction. Capital gains and losses are reported on Schedule D (Form 1040).●

POLLUTION CONTROL CAPITAL RECOVERY ACT OF 1980

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 6694, the Pollution Control Capital Recovery Act of 1980. This bill will change present law to allow federally mandated pollution control facilities and equipment to be amortized over 3, as opposed to 5 years.

It is now common knowledge that the rate of growth of American productivity has slackened in recent years. One of the causes for the recent decline in productivity growth has been the mandated investment pollution control facilities and equipment.¹ Secretary of the Treasury G. William Miller recently commented: "About 5 percent of all capital expenditures are devoted to pollution control abatement."² Almost all of these expenditures are borne by the manufacturers, and eventually, consumers of the product, through higher product costs.

Certainly, no rational person can argue against the need for clean air and clean water. Our national policy has been, and should continue to be oriented toward providing a safe and healthy environment for all its citizens.

However, the continued decline in the rate of productivity reduces everyone's standard of living. The end result is more inflation, less productive investment, declining real wages, and diminished job opportunities.

The answer to this dilemma is the Pollution Control Capital Recovery Act of 1980. This bill which I am introducing today would enhance efforts to guarantee a clean environment. It would allow companies to amortize federally mandated pollution control facilities and equipment over 3, as opposed to 5 years. As a result, companies would be able to more quickly recover their capital costs related to pollution control. This freed up capital could then be invested in production-oriented plant and equipment, thereby stimulating fixed investment and increasing productivity.

The Subcommittee on Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, which I chair, recently issued a report on hearings held in September 1979, on the subject of "Capital Formation and Retention." One of the recommendations was to allow federally mandated pollution control facilities and equipment to be amortized over a shorter period of time than

¹ "Explanation of Declining Productivity Growth," Edward F. Denison, Survey of Current Business, August 1979, vol. 59, No. 8, pt. II, pp. 1-24.

² Remarks of the Honorable G. William Miller, Secretary of the Treasury Before the White House Conference on Small Business, Washington, D.C., January 15, 1980.

present law permits. Our research indicated that total costs for pollution abatement amounted to 2 percent of the gross national product and will remain at this level through 1986. This increase in private and public sector spending for pollution abatement has had a negative effect on the rate of productivity growth and has increased the rate of inflation.

One hidden effect of this type of mandated investment is that it crowds out other types of capital investment. New productive investment is delayed, and the lower efficiency of the stock of capital is ultimately reflected in higher market prices.

Capital expenditure costs for pollution abatement are especially onerous for small business. Department of Commerce data indicate that in 1977, almost 39 percent of pollution abatement capital expenditures were incurred by firms which employ less than 500 employees. Almost 60 percent of these expenditures were incurred by firms with less than 1,000 employees.* It is clear that capital costs, coupled with legal and consulting fees necessary for compliance, place a heavy burden on a small firm's cash flow, since smaller companies generally pay more for capital, have higher debt-equity ratios and therefore, require more frequent financing.

For these important reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Pollution Control Capital Recovery Act of 1980.●

TOM STEED

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman for yielding to me. Like other Members of the House, I have learned with deep regret that the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. TOM STEED, has given notice that he is retiring from the House at the end of this session. TOM STEED is one of those Members who will be most missed. He has not only carried a great load for the House and the country as chairman of a very important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, but he is a warm personal friend of nearly every Member of the House. With wisdom, he has performed his duties as chairman of his subcommittee, appropriating billions of dollars. He has always sought to provide assistance to worthwhile needs coming within the jurisdiction of his subcommittee, but at the same time he has faithfully sought to spare the taxpayers of this country the expenditure of a single dollar not needed—really needed—by the subject of his subcommittee's appropriation.

* "Pollution Abatement Cost and Expenditures 1977." Current Industrial Reports, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1979, table IC, p. 7.

TOM STEED has been one of the pillars of this House; sturdy, dependable, responsible, able in the performance of his duties. He has also, with the warmth of his friendship and especially with his keen wit, been a source of pleasure to so many of the Members of the House. TOM STEED is a good and great man, a good and great American, a good and great Member of this House. I personally am saddened to see him leave. If I am here in the future, I shall enormously miss TOM STEED. He was always ready with a kind word, a warm greeting, and a good story. We are all going to be thinking about him wherever he is and whatever he does, wishing him good health, a happy life, and the enjoyment of the satisfactions which will make life most meaningful for him.●

WILLARD A. GENRICH BRINGS OUTSTANDING TALENT AND DEDICATION TO HIS NEW ROLE AS CHANCELLOR OF NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF REGENTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, how well future generations in America will cope with the responsibilities and benefits of a free society depends upon the quality of education available to them. Acutely aware of this and deeply dedicated to the improvement of both the quality and opportunities for education is Willard A. Genrich of Amherst, N.Y.

Last Wednesday, Mr. Genrich, who I am proud to say is a long-time personal friend and a constituent, was unanimously elected chancellor of the Board of Regents, New York State's prestigious educational policy agency. He is the first chancellor from western New York since the board was established in 1784.

Why Willard Genrich was the unanimous choice of the 15 members of the board, on which he has served with distinction since 1973, is clearly understandable. The record of his skillful attentiveness to the enhancement of the curricula and teaching excellence of the State's educational system, including the 63-campus university system, is outstanding.

He has been in the forefront of efforts to improve the competency of teachers, requirements for the granting of diplomas, and remedial programs for handicapped and disadvantaged students. He has supervised revisions in the New York State code governing the granting of licenses to doctors, dentists, engineers, and other professionals and has supported reforms in State-aid formulas to insure fairer treatment for poor school districts. He is an uncompromising champion of activists who work to upgrade basic standards of learning, at all levels of education.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has taken note of Willard Genrich's elevation to chancellor of the board of regents in its "Man in the News" column. I should like to share that column with my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1980]

UNANIMOUS CHOICE BY REGENTS—WILLARD ADOLPH GENRICH
(By Ari L. Goldman)

ALBANY, February 27.—The State Board of Regents unanimously elected Willard Adolph Genrich as its Chancellor today, and the 65-year-old Buffalo real estate man pledged that "the spirit of Camelot will be continued."

His statement recalling King Arthur's idyllic court said much about the Chancellor-elect and about the 15-member Board of Regents itself.

According to Regents sources, Camelot has never been so far away. The unanimous public vote followed months of tense infighting for control of the board that sets standards for state educational institutions—institutions that face serious financial and performance problems.

But the Regents, established in 1784, have shown a penchant for unanimity, a tendency to look on the bright side of things, and a reverence for orderly transition. As they chose their new Chancellor in the stately wood-paneled meeting room in the State Education Building today, their traditions were intact.

At the public meeting, there was no mention of the effort by Regent Martin C. Barell, a Democrat from Great Neck, L.I., to unseat the Republican leadership of the board. (In a closed-session vote, Mr. Genrich defeated the challenger by a vote of 9 to 6.) Nor was there mention of the problems of declining student performance and empty coffers. (Mr. Genrich praised the "great progress" made under Chancellor Theodore M. Black, and said that he hopes "to continue that leadership.")

"They took the safe candidate," said Assemblyman Melvin H. Miller, a Brooklyn Democrat. Mr. Miller, a former chairman of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, had lobbied for Mr. Barell, saying that he would be a more activist and innovative Chancellor. Of Mr. Genrich, he said, "if he's going to be like Black, he'll be a nice guy, do the right thing and keep the Regents in a low-profile position."

Chancellor Black was clearly pleased by the choice of Mr. Genrich, whose friends call him Woody. "Woody is like a rock," Mr. Black said. "He is solid. He has good ideas. I can call them good because they're the same as mine."

In addition to electing an upstate Republican as Chancellor, the Regents chose J. Edward Meyer, a Democrat from Chappaqua, in Westchester County, as Vice Chancellor. Mr. Meyer said he hopes to provide "balance" to the Regents leadership and "vim and vigor and a force for constructive change."

Mr. Genrich, a Republican, has served on the Board of Regents since 1973. Since then he has been the champion of conservative causes, although he bristles at the label. "I object to being called conservative or liberal," he said at a news conference following his selection today. "I believe in doing whatever is necessary to insure quality education."

Among the issues he has felt strongly about is busing. "I am opposed to forced busing except in cases of de jure segregation and as a last resort," he said today, contend-

ing that forcing parents and children to comply is "counterproductive." He was quick to add that he is "dedicated to integration" and to programs that foster voluntary desegregation.

A CHANGE OF VIEW ON TESTS

In other actions that have been labeled conservative, Mr. Genrich led the Regents opposition to accrediting the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Theological Seminary and voted against guidelines for sex education materials in the schools. He also voted against the establishment of a State University branch at a state prison. One issue on which the Chancellor-elect has changed his position was his earlier call for "minimum competency" tests for teachers. Today he said that he was "studying the issue."●

HARLEY O. STAGGERS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1980

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, HARLEY O. STAGGERS was a Congressman of the old school, a perfect gentleman who fought for his convictions and proved over and over again to be a winner. He served his constituents and his country well.

As a Republican, I can say that there are few men who have influenced me more by the power of their personality and apparent goodwill than Chairman STAGGERS. His patience during the energy conference he chaired was a tribute to those of us in the legislative field who work long and hard to come forth with laws that will benefit our Nation.

I have been honored and pleased to serve with him and will miss him in the years ahead.●

SHORTAGE OF NURSES

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 2, 1980, entitled "Why We Don't Have Enough Nurses" by Colman McCarthy.

This article is an excellent description of a situation which must be of interest to everyone concerned with health care in this country.

Our present health care system puts too much emphasis on physical resources and too little on human resources. While we concentrate attention on the allocation of high-technology treatment among competing institutions, we neglect the people who are responsible for actually providing most of the care that patients receive.

Nurses and other health care professionals are an invaluable resource of professional knowledge, compassion, and hands-on experience. It is time

they were acknowledged as full partners in the decisionmaking process of the health care system. It is time we stopped taking nurses for granted.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1980]

WHY WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH NURSES

(By Colman McCarthy)

Sigrid Eriksson, a nurse for 20 years, had the healthiest of reactions when she glanced down to check her notebook. "Nine probable hires," she said happily. "That's really pretty good. If we get only two hires, we've covered expenses."

That was odd talk for a nurse, except that Eriksson's elation came not as she worked in a hospital but as she was winding up her three days at a recent employment convention in a Washington hotel. She was one of two nurse recruiters at the booth (rented for \$340) of National Medical Enterprises, a Los Angeles firm that owns and manages some 40 hospitals in six states.

More than 60 other nurse recruiters had come to this job fair, all representing either hospitals or health care companies that are alarmed about—and aggressively taking action against—the chronic and often acute shortage of nurses.

The competition to find nurses is so intense that Nursing Job Fair, a Boston company, had scheduled employment conventions in seven major cities in the first four months of 1980. Each was booked to capacity by recruiters hard on the hunt for nurses.

Or at least nurses who want to work as nurses. Of the country's 1.4 million nurses, according to the American Nursing Association, some 420,000 are inactive. A survey commissioned by HEW projected that in 1982 a need will exist for between 1.2 and 1.6 million working nurses.

Geographically, some areas are more critical than others. Illinois has 106 hospitals that have 1,800 openings for nurses. The National League for Nursing reports that Arizona cannot fill 21 percent of its budgeted nursing slots. In western Tennessee, it is 33 percent, in Texas 14 percent and California 17 percent.

But behind the blacks and whites of the numbers game lie a number of grays that defy easy analysis but which suggest that the profession is currently bedeviled both by the demands of its own members from within and economic and social pressures from without. Some believe that nursing needs only an aspirin; others call for major surgery.

As members of a humanistic profession, nurses work within a natural tension; they are called on as a group to uphold altruistic values while individually each nurse is subjected to authoritarian and economic structures that can have little concern, much less reward, or intangibles like kindness and caring.

Nursing isn't a job; it's a vocation. It is 98 percent female but it is accountable to professionals—doctors and hospital administrators—who are mostly male. Worksites pressures can force the nurse who began as an idealist to burn out and become a mere functionary, ever cautious lest she turn up as the object of incident reports or patient gripes.

These philosophical probings are far from the concerns of the nurse recruiters. Round- ing up the workers is their mandate.

Imagination helps. A hospital in Des Moines, having trouble getting nurses to work the 11 p.m.-7 a.m. shift, offered the use of a new car as part of the deal for a one-year contract to work nights.

In a Long Beach, Calif., hospital the problem is not the night shift blues but the day-

time gripes: St Mary's Medical Center has installed what it calls "the job line" by which nurses can phone in their complaints anonymously.

In a Minneapolis hospital, a bounty of \$500 is paid any employee who brings in a registered nurse for full-time employment. Other hospitals around the country pay \$1,000.

In Palm Springs, Calif., the Desert Hospital has 300 nurses on its current staff. But with a planned expansion from 225 beds to 361 beds, about 30 more nurses are needed. "In order to insure the health and happiness of its nurses," the hospital said in the current issue of Nursing Job News, "an Employee Assistance Program has been created." It "provides counseling services for staff members who may be experiencing personal problems, such as financial difficulties, marital discord, alcoholism or substance abuse."

Even with new cars, job lines and perks, one fact remains: Nursing is hard work, often wearying and usually poorly paid. The average national salary for full-time working nurses is \$6.78 an hour, which in many areas is about the same wages as supermarket checkout clerks. Women dockworkers, unloading crates of bananas on the New York waterfront, earn \$10.40 an hour.

Although only some 15 percent of American's nurses are unionized, RN magazines reported last month that "full-time general duty nurses who are covered by AFL-CIO, Teamsters, state and federal employees union or other nonprofessional association contracts earn, on average, nearly 20 percent more than the mean for all full-time general duty nurses." Nurses working in private, for-profit hospitals receive salaries 2 percent below the mean.

A generation ago, nurses were thinking less about their low pay. The career alternatives were few. "For many young women," says Charlene Dean of the nurse recruitment office of Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, "it was pretty much a choice of one of the big three: nurse, teacher or secretary. But now it's changed. Just look at affirmative action. Women can get preferential treatment for mid-management positions in any number of industries that were once closed to them. And they start off with better salaries than a lot of nurses are making after 10 years in the hospital."

At the same time that nurses are making only the faintest progress financially—while toiling next to physicians whose average income is \$65,000—it appears also that they are working harder. Constance Holleran, a nurse and a lobbyist for the American Nursing Association, believes that "the demand on nurses has increased because of the changing nature of health care. People are in and out of the hospital so much faster today that the patients, while in the hospital, require more intensive nursing care. In the past, where one nurse might have had eight to 10 patients, she now has two or three—but who are very sick. Thus, throughout the hospital, you have the same number of patients but they are sicker. And the nurse must work harder."

As members of one of the traditional "women's professions," nurses are finding that suddenly both the definition and image of their work is changing.

The turf problem is the most obvious. The nurse of 1980 has moved into diagnostic, treatment and prescribing territories that were far off limits to the nurse of only 1960. She has also left behind, or is proudly walking around, much of the menial.

Susan Sparks Le Duc, in an aptly titled article, "We've Been Put Down Long Enough!" in a recent issue of RN magazine, described an incident in a pediatric unit: "A

doctor walked rapidly up to the nurses' station and proclaimed that a boy on the unit 'needed a nurse.' The nurse dropped what she was doing and went to the youngster, only to discover that what he needed was a diaper change."

State legislatures cannot protect nurses against being treated as cleanup crews by doctors, but medical practice laws have been changed in nearly 40 states in the past 10 years in ways that give expanded medical authority and responsibility to nurses.

What the legislatures don't give, many nurses are ready to take for themselves. Nurses of 20 or 30 years' experience tell of the days when they were seen as whitened angels fluttering at the feet of doctors playing God. If the deity entered the room, a nurse would instinctively rise and offer her chair. Today nurses not only stay put but they might be sitting there thinking about the best approach to take when they next witness a doctor giving incorrect or unethical medical treatment.

Occasionally, a nurse comes along who can take no more of the structure but who still loves her vocation, and refuses to leave it. Since 1971, Lucille Kinlein has seen 1,700 patients in her Hyattsville, Md., office. She practices nursing, not medicine. "Organized nursing and most nurses," she argues, "have chosen to remain under the mantle of medicine, with three results: One, achievement of professional status in the field is impossible. Two, the professionally oriented nurse cannot find fulfillment. Three, the public is deprived of a much needed and different kind of care."

In "Nurse," a best-seller about a big-city general hospital, Peggy Anderson summarizes what is happening: "Many nurses want to bring their own intelligence to the job and are becoming aggressive about doing so. A lot of our time is still spent carrying out orders written by doctors. But more and more often nurses are questioning those orders. Questioning is considered good nursing judgment. So is making suggestions to doctors about things that might help patients. So is refusing to carry out an order you disagree with, so long as you do it according to established procedures. I think a nurse must make decisions that affect what she's doing. If she's a robot, she's nothing."

Superficially, this thinking appears to be the early restiveness that will soon erupt into a rebellion against the doctors. In reality, it is an overdue move toward professional independence that separates medical diagnosis and care, the two intended to create harmony, not opposition.

This isn't mere theory. It is working in routine ways. A Washington-area physician, who has a high-volume office practice and employs eight full-time nurses, says that "90 percent of what I know and what I can do my nurses know and can do also. I have trained them in patient education, which is the key to sound medical practice. Even if I spend only five minutes with a patient in my office, my nurse can spend up to an hour afterwards. I make it a practice that no patient leaves my office without a chance to know as much about their disease as they desire. If they are still unhappy, I schedule them to come back early in the morning when I will give them all the time they want. The nurse that runs my office knows more about the mechanics of the specialty than most of the physicians in practice. Remember, she works with these problems every day and is experienced in both the side effects and benefits of the medications used."

However much this doctor's enlightenment creates an independent professional function for nurses, the handmaiden image still persists throughout all of medicine. A

survey by RN magazine noted that "three out of four doctors regard nurses as their assistants—and nothing more." The editors concluded that for nurses who care about "professional identity, this has got to be a fairly depressing statistic."

Another downer in the survey is that "more than 78 percent of the MDs believe nurses already have enough say in patient care, and close to another 10 percent feel they have too much authority already."

One of the most dramatic moves for independence is in the growth of supplemental personnel services. These are independent firms that allow nurses to choose if, when and where they work. The hospitals pay the firms and the latter pay the nurses.

Hospital administrators grumble about the supplementals, as do others in organizational settings. "These days," said one director of nursing at a local hospital, "everyone wants to work days, Monday through Friday. I have no shortage of nurses for those shifts. I run low in filling up nights, weekends and holidays."

Shift rotations may be health hazards in themselves. A 30-month study sponsored by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health found that rotation "imposes excessive physical and psychological costs on shift workers."

In Washington, lobbying groups like the American Nursing Association have their own struggles. In late 1978, President Carter pocket-vetoed the Nurse Training Act, a decision that meant a severe cutback in grants, loans and training aid programs. The administration argued that two decades' worth of federal aid had already gone to nursing schools and that the problem now was less in the shortage of nurses than in their retention.

Henry A. Foley, head of the Health Resources Administration, says there is no evidence that "we are suffering from a lack of production [of nurses]. We are just not holding them in the hospital setting once they are produced." Three problems still remain, Foley argues: low wages, inadequate training and sagging morale.

Budget fights are popular in Washington because an illusion of simplicity is created. Regarding nurses, both sides are right. Sen. Richard Schweiker (R-Pa.) had the facts with him when he told Foley during recent hearings that nurses laugh at the administration's health policy in nursing. "There isn't a hospital I go to that doesn't laugh at it and wonder what's wrong." And Foley is on firm ground when he says that "There's no evidence that if we keep producing nurses in the old way that they will stay in the profession. We have to be concerned about sitting down with nurses and hospitals and figuring out—together—ways to provide incentives for nurses to stay in the workforce."

The traditional out for this impasse is to summon a commission for "a study." That's what Congress did, with the interim findings due next fall. Or winter. Or spring.

Until a coming together of all interests occurs, nursing is likely to be trampled by one "no" after another: no to legislation for training funds, no to wage increases that might keep nurses from leaving to become real estate brokers, no to younger nurses asking for professional independence, no to union organizing, no to the movement that wants to shed the image of nurses as women who couldn't make it through college.

Into this vacuum of negativism, a few yesses are needed. Despite their being the largest part of the health care industry, nurses are probably the least difficult group to deal with. Large numbers of them are idealists.

Without some immediate and strong attention from outside the profession—from

physicians, administrators, politicians and bureaucrats—nurses are likely to be forced more and more to treat their ailing craft rather than the ailing patient. ●

DISMANTLE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—USE SAVINGS TO REDUCE BUDGET DEFICIT

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the evidence is pouring in on the kind of job the Department of Energy is doing in getting more gasoline and oil, in halting gaslines, and in keeping down the price of oil.

The DOE is doing just fine on these problems: In just 2 years, it has, by its own admission, caused shortages and long gasoline lines and squandered billions and billions of taxpayers' dollars as the price of heating oil and gasoline rose into the stratosphere.

In fact, the bipartisan Southern Governors Conference recently voted to abolish the Department of Energy.

A report released just a few days ago by the Government Operations Committee shows how the DOE itself is one of the worst offenders when it comes to wasting energy.

The Mattoon, Ill. Journal Gazette has wisely joined the call for DOE's dismantling and urged that the \$11 billion savings be used to reduce the Federal deficit. I hope my colleagues will heed this warning, as it is the cry from taxpayers as well.

The article follows:

[From the Mattoon Journal Gazette, Nov. 1, 1979]

DOE IS TARGET OF CONTEMPT

A measure of the contempt in which the oil industry holds the Department of Energy (DOE) can be seen in the statement of Samuel Schwartz, senior vice president of Continental Oil Company that "DOE has gone from infancy to senility in two years."

U.S. News and World Report recently carried a devastating analysis of the department which Mr. Carter launched with his famous statement that we were facing "the moral equivalent of war" in the energy crisis.

The department admitted that it was responsible for the gas shortages and long lines of motorists at the pumps because it had misallocated fuel on a priority basis which did not take into account fast growth areas.

Dissatisfaction with DOE was also expressed when the 17-member Southern Governor's Conference voted the agency's abolition, unless it started to become effective.

Louisiana Governor Edwin Edwards said "DOE was created to do something about the problem and has done nothing but make it worse."

The new Energy Secretary Charles W. Duncan, Jr. has been trying to restore some order to the giant bureaucracy where communication is one of its failures. The agency has grown into a sprawling giant with 20,000 employees, offices in 21 different government buildings and a budget of \$11 billion.

Its regulations are so complex, and in some cases contradictory, as to be unen-

forceable. And since Duncan assumed the job there have been many resignations and new faces. One DOE official is quoted as complaining "bodies are shuffling in and out of here so fast that it is hard to know who's doing what."

In our view the department's problem stems from the fact that it is impossible for a bureaucracy to make the correct decision which would be made in the market through the interaction of millions of daily decisions.

Being a thoroughly political man, as well as an ardent populist, Mr. Carter assumes that problems can be corrected by creating bureaus and by spending plenty of public money. DOE is a good example of the fallacy of this concept.

In the winter ahead it remains to be seen if DOE decisions will supply enough heating oil for the areas in which it is needed. It is our guess that the oil companies, in spite of DOE, will meet the need.

DOE should be dismantled as the Southern governors have resolved. The bumbling agency has only made matters worse. And the \$11 billion allocated to it could well be used to reduce the federal deficit. ●

BUDGET AND INFLATION

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the level of concern about inflation has risen perceptibly since the January consumer price index increase of 1.4 percent was announced February 22. That would mean 18 percent inflation if maintained all year. After enduring a full year of 13.9 percent inflation, Americans are truly alarmed.

The time has come for drastic action to halt the inexorable rise in Federal spending. Accordingly, I am introducing today a House resolution expressing the sense of the House that the House Budget Committee should report a budget resolution in which Federal outlays do not exceed 21 percent of the gross national product for fiscal year 1981.

Senator WILLIAM ROTH introduced a similar Senate resolution with more than 40 cosponsors last Wednesday. It is my understanding that the leadership of the Senate plans to have a vote on the resolution later this month. I believe it is important for the House to go on record along with the Senate.

I am well aware of the current Rules Committee task force hearings on legislation that would limit Federal spending by amending the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. In fact, I recently testified before the task force on behalf of my own spending limitation bill, H.R. 168. The adoption of the resolution I am introducing today would not negate the need for such permanent legislation. But an immediate declaration of intent by both the House and the Senate could produce immediate benefits by lowering inflationary expectations.

The Congress must come to grips with the fact that Federal spending is

out of control. Perhaps the most startling evidence of that is the record of the past few years since the Budget Act became fully effective in 1977.

During this time Federal expenditures increased from \$403 billion in fiscal year 1977 to a requested \$616 billion in fiscal year 1981. That is a \$213 billion increase or a 53-percent increase in expenditures in just 4 years. To make matters worse, these figures do not include off-budget expenditures, which increased from \$8.7 billion in fiscal year 1977 to a request of \$18.1 billion in fiscal year 1981.

This unprecedented increase in expenditures occurred during a time of relatively high economic growth when traditional theory dictated a slowing of the increases in Government spending.

If the growth in Federal expenditures was equal to the rate of growth in the economy, then some of the concern about expenditures would be relieved. But this has clearly not been the case. This growth in Government spending since 1977 has been so strong it has greatly surpassed the growth rate of the economy. In 1977 the percentage of GNP—seasonally adjusted annual rates—going to the Federal Government was 19.1 percent, already well over the historical average of 18 percent. For 1980, outlays will be more than 22 percent of GNP. As a consequence, more and more of the Nation's resources were taken by the Federal Government.

Federal spending has gained a momentum of its own which has carried it well above levels conducive to economic growth. Spending levels are so high that they are preventing tax relief for Americans which is needed if economic growth is to resume. More spending will mean less growth, and an ever-increasing share of our national economy will be consumed by Government.

Despite the discouraging economic performance of our economy, the situation is not hopeless. We can have inflation free economic growth that will mean jobs for more Americans and a rising standard of living for all. But we must select the correct policy mix to achieve our goals.

A cap on Federal spending is a first step. Next, we must move to increase real economic growth through tax reductions designed not to pump money into the economy, but to restructure the tax code to increase the after tax reward to additional saving, investment, production, and employment.

A comprehensive approach to these problems is outlined in the 1980 Joint Economic Committee annual report, released last week with the unanimous endorsement of the entire committee, both Democrats and Republicans. Quick action on the resolution I am introducing today would be an early indication that the Congress is ready to take the steps the JEC has recommended to fight inflation and encourage real economic growth. ●

POSSE COMITATUS: A DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, an organization known as Posse Comitatus has been operating in northern Wisconsin in a manner similar to that of the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi Party, and other radical, paramilitary groups.

A newspaper in my district, the Wausau Daily Herald, recently performed a valuable public service by publishing a series of articles exposing the malignant activities of Posse Comitatus. I submit these articles to be reprinted in the RECORD.

I am concerned that the Justice Department has not taken a closer look at organizations such as Posse Comitatus and I hope these articles will help stimulate a national awareness of the problem.

The growth and influence of groups such as this one represent a dangerous and fundamental threat to the values of a democratic society. The Herald articles make this clear.

There are two kinds of political activists in our society: those who feel the ends justify the means and those who don't. It is ironic that Posse Comitatus and similar groups attempt to wrap themselves in the Declaration of Independence and the Bible in an effort to justify actions which are abhorrent to civilized religious and democratic beliefs.

Democracy is really two things. Not only is it a series of goals and values; but it is also a process, a way of doing things. That process itself is the greatest protection for the rights of individual citizens in this society. When people take unto themselves the right to determine what is law and what is not, they are destructive of the process that is the very essence of democracy.

The Posse record is one of lawlessness, intimidation, and a sick promotion of racial and religious bigotry.

Public officials have experienced irrational actions by groups such as the Posse for years. It is important that the general public, too, be fully aware of their activities and the threat they pose to society.

Five years ago, a cadre of police and deputies was required to prevent Posse members from blocking free entry and exit by Senator GAYLORD NELSON and me at a State farm convention in Marshfield. About the same time, Posse members passed out vicious antisemitic literature at a hearing of the House of Representatives Dairy Subcommittee which I arranged in Merrill. Members of my staff experienced veiled efforts at intimidation in Clark County 3 years ago and well-known Posse members have tried to

disrupt a number of public meetings held by me throughout the years.

The press cannot do the job of exposing these groups by itself. Elected public officials have a special obligation to speak out against the danger posed by extremist groups with storm trooper fantasies who seek to gain by intimidation what they cannot gain by persuasion. I applaud the courage and patriotism of local and State officials who have withstood this intimidation and have spoken out strongly against those groups that undermine representative government and the rule of law.

As an editorial in the Clark County Press of Neilville, Wis., noted recently, it would be nice to write the Posse off as a bunch of Keystone cops running around with their guns and badges, but those are real guns and it is real people who could get hurt.

Even if there were no danger of direct violence, we still have the responsibility to expose and isolate groups such as the Posse Comitatus who, in their misguided efforts to redefine the law, destroy the very process of law which protects them and every other citizen.

Americans are aware of the saying, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." The efforts of Posse leaders to redefine the meaning of the Constitution and of statutory law is a perfect example.

I submit the following articles in the interest of increased national awareness of these antidemocratic groups:

THE POSSE: LEGAL OR NOT?

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

The Posse Comitatus—what is it?

Who are they?

What do they stand for?

These questions are being asked with increasing frequency today—and the answers are not always easy to find.

Members of the Posse, and a close affiliate—the Life Science Church—have gained a great deal of notoriety in the past few weeks as they have filed "common law" liens against the property of a number of elected officials, including 32 members of the Marathon County Board.

FIRST IN SERIES

Adding to their visibility has been the Posse's assertion that it will use armed force if law enforcement officials attempt to remove a trailer home from a town of Easton farm.

The liens and the trailer issue are connected. Most of the liens filed in Marathon County were filed by Wayne Rydell, who lives on property where the trailer is located.

He filed the liens after Marathon County Judge Ronald Keberle ordered the trailer removed because it was installed without having a percolation test or receiving a conditional use permit. Percolation tests are required under state statutes and town ordinances require a conditional use permit for trailer homes.

Rydell refused to remove the trailer and set the stage for a confrontation between law enforcement officials and the Posse Comitatus.

What is the Posse?

Its name is derived from a Latin term meaning "power of the county."

A dictionary says the term applies to "the entire body of the inhabitants who may be summoned by the sheriff to assist in preserving the public peace (as in a riot) or in executing a legal precept that is forcibly opposed, including under the common law every male inhabitant who is above 15 years of age and not infirm."

However, no sheriff has summoned today's Posse Comitatus. The group is assembling on its own.

Posse members agree that the sheriff has the power to form a posse, but add that others may volunteer to join if not asked. If the sheriff does not form a posse, they say citizens have their own right to form one.

The Posse is a right-wing group. Its members' beliefs are a mixture of the Constitution, common law, the Bible and the Magna Carta. The group appears to have little use for some recently enacted laws and even less respect for administrative rules, non-elected government officials and judicial interpretations of the law.

Question Posse members about the law and they will tell you to read the Constitution or they will quote a phrase from it or some other law.

Their interpretation of the law has been questioned by some legal officials.

"They pick and choose statements that serve a single-minded purpose without regard to what those statements apply to," Marathon County corporation counsel Jeffery Drach told the County Board last week.

But the Posse is more than rhetoric.

Some of its members don't hesitate to carry guns in public. Others are said to have stockpiled firearms and ammunition. Bunkers, underground tunnels and military-like maneuvers have all been linked to the Posse in central Wisconsin.

The Posse has also been known to harass government officials when those officials disagree with Posse positions. The recent statewide filing of so-called "common law" liens is an example.

The liens, which were filed against elected local and state officials, judges and government employees, said those named violated the filer's civil rights. All the liens have been traced to members of the Posse Comitatus or the Life Science Church.

More than 40 "common law" liens were filed in Marathon County alone during the last three weeks. All were filed by either Wayne Rydell of the town of Easton or Richard Kauffman of rural Loyal. Both men publicly admit an affiliation with the Life Science Church.

Kauffman said he is a member of the Posse. Rydell could not be contacted, although his father, C. Leonard Rydell, was.

The senior Rydell would not comment when asked if he is a member of the Posse Comitatus, although he did say that he is friends with Thomas Stockheimer and James Wickstrom, two Posse leaders.

Rydell said both men were at his farm Friday to help him defend it in case law enforcement officials attempted to remove the trailer.

The senior Rydell said his son filed the liens because those named violated his civil rights.

"You study the Constitution and then see how those guys voted on the county administrator," he said during a telephone interview Monday night.

When told that some of those named in the liens had voted against creating the administrator post, Rydell said, "Maybe we made a mistake, although I don't believe what you're saying."

Rydell wouldn't say much more over the phone, contending it was bugged.

RYDELL SUSPENDED AS BUS DRIVER

C. Leonard Rydell, a town of Easton farmer who says he's a pastor of the Life Science Church, was temporarily suspended Tuesday from his job as a school bus driver.

The suspension occurred after parents of D.C. Everest School District students who ride the bus petitioned the district for Rydell's removal.

George Longo, superintendent of schools for the Everest district, said the parents expressed concern about Rydell's recent actions involving the Posse Comitatus, a right-wing group.

Armed members of the Posse Comitatus were at Rydell's farm Friday, contending they would shoot anyone who attempted to remove a house trailer from the property. Circuit Judge Ronald Keberle ordered the trailer removed because it was illegally installed, failing to comply with state and town zoning requirements.

Rydell's son, Wayne, filed numerous liens against Marathon County public officials, following Keberle's ruling in the mobile home dispute.

Parents discussed the situation and started to withhold their children from the bus on Monday, using a carpool to get them to school, Longo said.

Dewey Reinstra, vice president and manager of Ceranski Bus Transportation, which serves the Everest District, said the company didn't have a choice in suspending Rydell "in lieu of the petitions from the parents."

The school district retains the right to approve and disapprove any driver, he said.

"I can't say whether the suspension will be permanent or not," he said.

Parents contend Rydell passed out notices of a Posse Comitatus meeting to one or two students on the bus last week, Reinstra said.

Longo said there were complaints that Rydell also passed out right-wing literature on the bus in the past.

Reinstra said that Rydell had been driving school buses for about 14 years. Both he and Longo said Rydell's driving was satisfactory.

STOCKHEIMER ARRESTED

Thomas Stockheimer of Tigerton, a leader of the Posse Comitatus, was arrested Tuesday afternoon in Shawano by Shawano County sheriff's deputies.

Sheriff Robert Montour said Stockheimer was arrested on a violation stemming from a warrant issued by Clark County. The warrant alleged that Stockheimer had practiced law without a license.

Montour said Stockheimer was released after a \$500 cash bond was posted in Clark County.

Stockheimer, when contacted in Tigerton Tuesday night, said the warrant resulted when Clark County officials tried to prevent him from inspecting civil defense shelters for adequate food supplies.

Stockheimer said he would file charges against Judge Michael Brennan, Sheriff Harlan Suddermeyer and the State Patrol. He contends they conspired to prevent him and other self-appointed "peace officers" from searching the shelters.

"THE POSSE" ARRIVED IN 1974

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

Few had ever heard of the Posse Comitatus when it came to central Wisconsin in 1974.

But the group's name intrigued many into taking a look at the organization.

Some thought it was a legitimate sheriff's

auxiliary. Others, including Marathon County Sheriff Louis Gianoli, were unsure what it was so they attended early Posse meetings to learn more about the group.

Some, including Gianoli, were startled by what they heard. The sheriff quickly disavowed any association with the group.

"You can't take legal power into your own hands," Gianoli said in citing why he disagreed with the Posse. "They claim deputy power through the Constitution. We need a Supreme Court ruling on this that will say one and for all that they don't have the power."

Others received the Posse message differently. They joined a group that a few years ago claimed 2,500,000 members nationwide, according to Thomas Stockheimer, a leader and charter member of the Posse Comitatus in Wisconsin. Since then, the Posse has been growing in "leaps and bounds," he says.

Stockheimer, a former Mosinee resident, said he doesn't know how many men belong to the Posse in Wisconsin.

(Other estimates put the Posse at about 10,000 members nationwide with about 200 active members in Wisconsin.)

Stockheimer and six other men—Raymond Omernick, Thomas Peterson, R. David Pennings, Albin Ostrowski, Ron Balthazor and Rodney Hilmershauser—chartered the Posse Comitatus in central Wisconsin.

Two of those men, Ostrowski and Balthazor, apparently left the group shortly after its founding.

Ostrowski told the Herald in April 1974 that he and Balthazor "pulled out of that kid stuff group because we didn't understand what the thing was about when we signed the papers."

Three of the charter members—Stockheimer, Omernick and Pennings—became prominent newsmakers.

Stockheimer gained notoriety for his run-in with the law; Omernick for his fights with the state Department of Natural Resources and his election to the state Assembly in the 86th District; and Pennings for allegedly manufacturing Laetrile at his plant, Mosinee Research, which was moved from Mosinee to Manitowoc a few years ago.

Omernick says he left the Posse after the sheriff failed to endorse it and hasn't been a member for several years. Yet, it was Omernick's confrontations with the DNR in 1976 that generated a scene that many people, justly or unjustly, still associate with the Posse.

The confrontation started when Omernick diverted water from Holt Creek to irrigate his potato fields. A court order was obtained to stop him and one of his pumps was seized.

Omernick responded by stationing armed guards around his property and posting no-trespassing signs. The signs read:

"Govt. agents and others. No trespassing. \$10,000 fine, 10 years prison, title 18 Sec. 241, 242 U.S. Criminal Code. Warning. Survivors will be prosecuted. Owner, Ray Omernick."

The signs' lettering and wording are identical to a sign now posted in front of a trailer in the town of Easton, which is the scene of the latest Posse confrontation. The only difference on the sign at Easton is the signature, which lists the property as belonging to the Life Science Church.

A confrontation between Omernick's armed guards and law enforcement officials never occurred.

The charges were dismissed when Omernick agreed to comply with the law by stopping the diversion of water, said Marathon County District Attorney Rand Krueger.

He said Omernick drilled wells at a substantial cost in order to get water.

Krueger added that Omernick's version of the dismissal differs from his.

"Omernick says the charges were dismissed because the state couldn't prove its case," Krueger said. "I've discussed it with him many times and told him 'Ray, you can say whatever you want but I was there when we reached the agreement.'"

Omernick's differences with the DNR and the courts started in 1960 when former Judge Gerald Bolleau issued an injunction against Omernick for diverting water from a stream without state permission. The judge also fined him \$1,000. Other diversion problems in both Marathon and Portage Counties followed.

Omernick said he originally became interested in the Posse Comitatus when he had his problems with the DNR.

"I got involved because the DNR, through the courts and Legislature, was causing farmers to lose their rights," he said. "I dropped out when the sheriff did not back it."

Omernick would not give a specific date on which he left the Posse, but said the armed men who were protecting his property during the summer of '76 were employees from his farm and not Posse members.

Stockheimer's problems with the law included a conviction for assaulting an Internal Revenue Service agent near Abbotsford in 1974. The agent, Fred Chicken of Wausau, was forced to sit in a chair while Stockheimer preached to him on the Posse's purpose and lectured him that income tax is a Marxist concept designed to destroy the United States.

Stockheimer was convicted of the charge in 1974, but disappeared before he went to prison. A fugitive warrant was issued against him and three years later he was arrested in West Virginia.

Stockheimer served nine months at the federal minimum-security prison in Sandstone, Minn. While there, he spent much time studying law.

"I always had an aptitude toward law and was always interested in it, especially constitutional law," he said. "For nine months, I practically lived in the law library at the penitentiary."

Stockheimer's other problems with the law included an incident in Eau Claire, where he allegedly sprayed Mace at a DNR hearing, and most recently, charges in Clark County of practicing law without a license. He was arrested on the latter charge Tuesday in Shawano, but was released after a \$500 cash bond was posted.

According to the Madison Capital Times, Stockheimer was also indicted for trying to influence a jury in Dubuque, Iowa. In that case, another Marathon County man, Charles Dodge, was convicted on federal tax charges.

The federal probes involving Mosinee Research Corp. occurred in Manitowoc, although several Marathon and Lincoln County residents were involved. The firm was once a dental supply house in Mosinee. It was taken over by Pennings in 1973. Stockheimer and Peterson were both employed there after Pennings became the owner.

Peterson was convicted in 1975 of making false and fraudulent income tax statements.

The president of the firm, Albert C. Iwen of Merrill, denies membership in the Posse.

Mosinee Research shifted its operations to Manitowoc after a fire damaged its Marathon County plant. It was there that agents of the Food and Drug Administration raided the plant and seized bags of apricot kernels, unfilled capsules and other substances that

the FDA said were used to manufacture Laetrile.

Laetrile, a drug that some people believe cures cancer, is illegal in Wisconsin. The FDA has never approved it and contends that it's medically worthless.

In all the cases, those involved have defended their actions by saying their Constitutional rights have been violated by the government—a claim that is now being made by a farmer in the Marathon County town of Easton. That situation will be discussed in tomorrow's story.

POSSE JUSTICE DESCRIBED

"He should be removed by the Posse to the most populated intersection in the township and at high noon be hung by the neck, the body remaining until sundown as an example to those who subvert the law."

That quote is from a Posse Comitatus handbook and describes the Posse's ultimate action for dealing with "officials of government who commit criminal acts or who violate their oaths of office."

Guilt or innocence of such violations is determined by the Posse, not by the courts.

Members of the Posse view courts with disdain. They claim that most judges are corrupt and act with disregard for the Constitution.

"It is apparent the judiciary has attempted to alter our form of government," says the handbook, adding that the courts and the legal profession have conspired to form a dictatorship over the people.

"The highest court of the land is the justice of the peace court, which is the closest to the people," the handbook says.

The Posse rejects the court's power to empanel juries, saying juries should be formed by the citizens, meaning the Posse.

The Posse also questions the paying of income taxes, even though the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution authorizes an income tax and the Posse professes a strong adherence to the Constitution.

The handbook states that the Internal Revenue Code enacted by Congress to implement the income tax is "unlawful and not binding upon the people nor the states of the Union."

It says: "The entire code is a string of unconstitutional abuses which attempt to require a citizen's consent to repudiation and violation of his God-given and Constitutional rights."

Any official who tries to enforce the revenue laws should be removed from office, according to the handbook. "Where instances are known, the Posse Comitatus should prepare an 'order for arrest' of the official involved," it says.

The handbook also contends that the nation's monetary system has been illegal since the Federal Reserve System was created to regulate the Nation's money supply.

The Posse views the county sheriff as the chief executive of a county and claim a right to assist him.

The Posse holds the sheriff in awe as long as the sheriff does what it wants. But let the sheriff enforce a law that the Posse doesn't like (one its members call unconstitutional), and the Posse believes it has the right to intervene.

"Once he (the sheriff) has been advised of unlawful acts (as defined by the Posse) and refuses to perform his lawful duty, the Posse Comitatus has the lawful right under the natural law to act in the name of the sheriff to protect local jurisdiction," says the booklet.

It calls for the courts to stop using sheriffs as "lackeys" to enforce the court rulings.

"There are no lawful authority for judges

and courts to direct the law enforcement activities of a county sheriff," says the handbook.

RYDELL, EASTON PEOPLE TELL CONCERNS (By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

Some people in the town of Easton are beginning to talk about fear.

There's the fear of people living along Church Road when they see armed men patrolling the road and a neighboring farm. They're worried that the men, identified as members of the Posse Comitatus, might start a shoot-out with law enforcement officials, jeopardizing the safety of the neighborhood.

That fear is shared by some Easton parents who decided not to let their children ride a school bus driven by a man who lives at the Posse-guarded farm.

Carl Leonard Rydell, the head of the family who lives at the farm and the man who up until Tuesday drove the bus, says he has fears too.

He has fortified his property with bunkers and warning signs to discourage law enforcement authorities from entering.

Rydell talks about the time when deer hunters on a neighboring farm "scared the hell" out of him with stray shots. He mentions the two gunshot wounds his German shepherd received this past weekend from someone with unknown motives.

What has caused these fears?

The situation started when the Rydell family installed a mobile home on their farm without getting percolation test or conditional use permit.

The Easton Town Board took them to court, where Judge Ronald Keberle ruled that the trailer was installed illegally and ordered it removed. The Rydells refused and said they would use firearms if sheriff's deputies tried to move the trailer.

Rydell said no one has a right to tell him what he can do on his property. He referred to seeking a conditional use permit as "going before eight guys (a town planning commission) and letting them tell you what kind of house to build."

Town officials said they couldn't say whether a conditional use permit would have been granted because the Rydells never requested one or showed their plans. Before such a permit can be issued, a hearing must be held.

Rydell refused to say whether he belongs to the Posse Comitatus. He said he knows Thomas Stockheimer and James Wickstrom, two Posse leaders from Tigerton. Rydell said they were at his farm last Friday to help him defend it.

Easton residents view the situation differently. Several town residents interviewed during visits to Easton said the laws governing percolation tests and zoning should be enforced equitably.

"Why should I be forced to get a percolation test if they don't make him get one?" one resident asked.

Several other things irritate the residents. They dislike the Rydells' "taking the law into their own hands"; the senior Rydell's passing out of right-wing literature to students who rode his school bus (he was suspended as a driver Tuesday after Easton parents petitioned for his removal and started withholding their children from his bus); the Rydells' deeding of their property to the Life Science Church in what is viewed as a way to avoid paying property taxes; and a recent comment made by Wayne Rydell, one of Carl Leonard's two sons.

The comments was Wayne's assertion on television that he is ready to die defending his country and the Constitution.

"If he's so eager to defend his country,

why did he run off to Canada during Vietnam?" one woman asked, echoing a sentiment that was expressed by all the Easton residents contacted.

When a Herald reporter went to the Rydell farm earlier this week, Carl Leonard Rydell said Wayne wasn't home. The senior Rydell was then asked if the statements made by townspeople were true.

He responded: "You should know better than to ask that. Vietnam was never a war to defend our country. Don't talk so foolish. Vietnam was no fight to defend this country."

"Did he go to Canada?" asked the reporter.

"No comment," replied Rydell. "He didn't go to Canada. They drove him up there."

"Who are they?"

"No comment," Rydell said.

Townspeople, some who expressed fear of the Posse Comitatus if they were quoted by name, painted the following picture of the Rydells.

The family lived peacefully at their farm for years. They're remembered for regularly attending a Lutheran church in town. Carl Rydell also worked as a mechanic at the farm besides farming and driving a school bus.

Wayne moved to Canada during the Vietnam War but area residents remember him coming back for periodic visits.

In September 1976, the Rydells transferred title of their farm to the Life Science Church, removing it from the tax rolls. Carl Leonard listed himself as a pastor of the church while sons Wayne and Warren became trustees. Witnesses to the transfer were Leonard Ginter and Raymond Omernick, who is now a state assemblyman in the 86th District.

Rydell refused to answer questions about the Life Science Church but did give a Herald reporter a booklet that he said contains all the church's beliefs.

The first paragraph in the booklet reads: "The basic Doctrines, Principles and Beliefs held as 'Truth' of the Life Science Church are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. (The 16th and 25th Amendments are not included in the Doctrine of the LSC.)"

The 16th Amendment authorizes income tax and the 25th Amendment deals with succession to the presidency.

The booklet contains four pages outlining the beliefs of the church and the full texts of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, including the 16th and 25th amendments.

The booklet also listed a Jerome Daly as president of the Life Science Church and gave the parent church's address as a box number at Twin City Airport, Minnesota.

A charter for the church reads: "That the church shall be governed by three or more trustees who shall hold all real and personal property in trust as joint tenants of the chartered church. No property will become the property of the parent church unless given by gift or bequest."

A 1976 story in the Herald on the transfer read: "One of the first moves to escape property taxes through transfers of property to a church was recorded in the office of the register of deeds here."

The story went on to describe the transfer and noted that in recent weeks there were news stories from Eastern cities of property holders becoming bishops and ministers by paying a nominal sum to a "mother church." It said the ministers hoped "to escape paying property taxes by living in tax-exempt parsonages."

Carl Leonard Rydell said the Herald had no right to run the story and said the paper

never contacted him about his motives for the transfer.

When asked what his motives were, he replied: "No comment."

He later said: "People call us tax evaders, but we pay taxes just like everyone else."

Despite that claim, both Leonard and Warren Rydell have liens and warrants filed against them by the state of Wisconsin and the federal government for failing to pay income taxes.

Townspeople also mention Rydell's stockpiling of weapons and an underground tunnel on the property.

The senior Rydell said of the weapons that he doesn't hunt, but has more guns than needed for just hunting.

Rydell admitted that he had a tunnel running from his home to a pump house. It was installed before the air raid shelters of the 1960s and is used for cold storage of fruits and vegetables and for access between the buildings, he said.

POSSE HELD GRAND JURY

When members of the Posse Comitatus don't like what's happening in government, they usually conclude that government officials are disregarding the Constitution.

They then claim the Declaration of Independence gives them the right to intervene to correct or abolish the corrupt government.

It was that thinking that led to a so-called "Christian citizens" grand jury in Spooner in 1974.

The "grand jury" was never approved by a judge as required by state statute. It was empaneled by members of the Posse Comitatus, who believe they have the right to take the law in their own hands when government officials don't act as they wish. The grand jury was presided over by Thomas Stockheimer, a founding Posse member who's had run-ins with the law. Stockheimer said the "grand jury" issued dozens of "subpoenas."

He added that the general issue before the "grand jury" was whether the state Department of Natural Resources abused, harassed, usurped and violated the Constitution.

Stockheimer said the case centered around Gerald McFarren of Marion and his disputes with the DNR over alleged bulldozing in a lake bed.

McFarren was the American Party candidate for the U.S. Senate at the time of the Posse hearing.

McFarren was involved in a dispute with the DNR over bulldozing in Washburn County in the late 1960s. McFarren claimed he bulldozed on his property. The DNR said he bulldozed in a lake bed.

A county court jury acquitted McFarren of filling the lake, but the state then filed a civil suit against him.

The civil suit was dismissed but the case was appealed to the state Supreme Court, which ordered the DNR to hold a hearing.

The hearing, which was slated a week before the Posse "grand jury," was canceled when a bomb threat was received.

Stockheimer said that about 40 people testified at the "grand jury" but none of the politicians or members of the DNR who were "subpoenaed" appeared.

Among some of the politicians who were "subpoenaed" by the Posse were former Govs. Patrick Lucey and Warren Knowles, former Attorney General Robert Warren, U.S. Rep. David Obey and state Sens. Walter John Chilsen and Gerald Lorge.

Stockheimer said at the time that "indictments" would be issued and would be taken to a circuit court judge for action.

No "indictments" from the "grand jury" were ever accepted by a circuit court.

NEED NOT ACCEPT LIENS: LA FOLLETTE

MADISON, Wis.—County registers of deeds are not obligated to accept multimillion dollar property liens filed against public officials by members of the Sheriff's Posse Comitatus, Attorney General Bronson La Follette says.

In a letter to county officials Thursday, La Follette said he soon will issue a formal opinion on the Posse's filing of numerous property liens against officials.

Members of the Posse, which has a number of chapters in Wisconsin, have filed or attempted to file a number of "common law" property liens against public officials in recent weeks.

"I am issuing this letter at this time so that county corporation counsels and district attorneys may advise their respective registers of deeds that they are not obligated to accept such instruments for recording or filing," La Follette said.

In a suit over La Follette's property, a Posse member alleged that his constitutional rights were "repeatedly violated by malicious and illegal acts" of the attorney general.

Earlier this month, La Follette called the actions "frivolous" and contemptuous of the legal process. He has asked the state Supreme Court to declare that suits filed by about 30 people believed to be members of the Posse as obstructions of justice.

HILMERSHAUSER SAYS HE'S LEFT THE POSSE

Rodney L. Hilmershauser, one of the seven men who chartered the Posse Comitatus in Marathon County in 1974, said today that he left the organization five years ago.

He said he got out of the organization because he did not want it corrupting his family.

"I don't like violence at all. It could lead into something very bad," he said. "I'm not for violence and I'd rather not have anything to do with it anymore."

"I just want to go about my own business and keep my name clean. As for the Posse Comitatus, maybe it's good, maybe it's bad. I just don't care anymore."

TIGERTON—HOME OF THE POSSE

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

Nature left its beauty mark in southeastern Shawano County.

It graced the area with rolling hills, forests and the Embarrass River, which forms a scenic dells at Tigerton.

Nature gave the dells tranquility, but today that peace is threatened by man-made tension caused by the Posse Comitatus.

Some members of the Posse are busy buying large quantities of arms, training in military maneuvers and building bunkers and tunnels for a siege that members contend could come from fellow Americans as easily as from foreign invaders.

The Posse's activities are centered on 577 acres of land, mostly owned by Donald and Sally Minniecheske.

Donald is a Posse member and a former member of the Shawano County Board. Sally does not belong to the Posse. Only males over 15 are allowed to join.

The 577 acres include 29 acres that were deeded by the Minniecheskes to the Life Science Church a few years ago.

The land includes a resort called Tigerton Dells, a big, fading building that has a large, framed portrait of the late U.S. Sen. Joseph McCarthy of Appleton in one of its bars, a farm with a house and several trailers that serve as homes for members of the Posse Comitatus and their families.

One of the trailers is the residence of Thomas Stockheimer, a Posse leader and one of the founders of the Posse Comitatus in Wisconsin.

A Madison newspaper reporter described Stockheimer's trailer as follows: "A wooden rack just inside Stockheimer's door holds five rifles, two of them semi-automatic, with C-shaped ammo clips protruding menacingly from their stocks. On a bulletin board in his kitchen are posters, clippings, buttons, bumper stickers, most with right-wing extremist slogans, some with anti-Israeli and white-power messages."

Stockheimer did not meet with Herald staffers in Tigerton earlier this week. He was arrested in Shawano earlier in the day on a warrant and did not return to Tigerton until the evening.

He was later contacted by phone and was most willing to discuss his philosophy.

Stockheimer said the Posse Comitatus "most definitely" was stockpiling weapons and ammunition, training in military maneuvers and building tunnels and other "defensive" fortifications.

One newspaper quoted a rural priest as saying that last year the Posse staked out an airport to determine how many people it would have to kill to take the facility.

Stockheimer said Posse members were taking the steps to be prepared to defend their property and families.

"It's convenient to ignore situations, to play ostrich, but a stitch in time saves nine," he said.

Stockheimer and other Posse members said they would use their arsenals against invaders, both foreign and domestic.

It's the "domestic invaders" who seem to worry the Posse the most. Those "invaders" might be citizens from the southern part of the state who might be evacuated to northern Wisconsin in event of a nuclear war, or government officials who might enter their property to enforce the law, Stockheimer says.

Stockheimer and other Posse members said the evacuees would have no food or shelter and would plunder the countryside to satisfy their needs.

"If the food you saved for your children is given to others, what will happen to your children?" he asked.

"I would do anything I had to to defend this country, but you can't defend this country in a foreign nation," he said. "If the enemy was fighting in New York, then I would fight 'cause that's America."

Other Posse members took a more narrow view. They said fighting for their country and family did not mean fighting to repel foreign invaders from New York, Chicago or Milwaukee. Doing that would leave no one to protect their families, they said.

Stockheimer moved to the Minniecheske property after he was released from a federal penitentiary where he served nine months for assaulting an Internal Revenue Service agent.

The Minniecheskes first came into the news when Tigerton Dells lost its liquor license. That ruined their plans to develop the resort into a major tourist haven, Mrs. Minniecheske said.

She claims the license was lost because the state wants their land for a park. To prevent that, the Minniecheskes deeded 29 acres of their property to the Life Science Church a few years ago.

Mrs. Minniecheske said the state Department of Natural Resources has wanted the land since the 1900s but the family won't sell.

But Charles Higgs, district director of the DNR's Green Bay office, said the state is not interested in the land. He said the Minniecheskes asked the state to buy it a few

years ago. The DNR reviewed the property and determined that it was not suitable for a state park. The Minniecheskes were informed of the state's decision last year, he said.

The Minniecheskes persist in their claim, contending the state and other government units are conspiring to get their property.

The Minniecheskes do not mention Donald's convictions of selling liquor and beer to minors or his selling of intoxicants and tobacco without a license in talking about the loss of their license.

Mrs. Minniecheske did say that denial of the liquor permit has caused her to lose her livelihood and forced her to go on welfare. There's not much business here anymore," she said.

Yet, the afternoon two Herald staffers were at Tigerton Dells, several customers, including at least two known members of the Posse, came into the establishment, placing orders. One of the men purchased a can of beer. The others bought non-alcoholic items.

Tigerton Dells still rents its hall for weddings, Mrs. Minniecheske said. The resort has two bars, separated by a partial wall. Neither displayed alcoholic beverages. One bar, the smaller of the two, had candy bars and snacks behind the counter. A few signs listed prices for sandwiches and pizza, although Mrs. Minniecheske said they discontinued serving hot food when they lost their liquor license.

RESIDENTS FRUSTRATED

What do Tigerton residents think of the Posse Comitatus?

Most would like to get rid of them once and for all, according to a community leader who asked not to be identified.

"We wish we could get it solved," he said. "Nobody here is very proud of it."

Tigerton has become identified as one of the strongholds of the Posse Comitatus in Wisconsin because a number of its leaders—including Thomas Stockheimer, Donald Minniecheske and James Wickstrom—live there and openly practice their military maneuvers in woods outside of town.

"You see them strutting around town with guns," the man said. "I thought the days of Dillinger (a Depression era bank robber) were over."

The man said many of Tigerton's citizens are frustrated by the Posse's presence and disregard for the law.

"We're tired of seeing them run the government down and say how no good it is and then seeing them always buying food with food stamps and living off the taxpayers," he said.

The man said many of Tigerton's citizens feel the state has not acted to counter the Posse. "All I think is that if the state wants zoning and laws, it should enforce them. I don't know why I should pay for a building permit when they don't have to."

The man pointed out other discrepancies. "How come you or I would get arrested for having an uncased gun in a car, but they (the police) let these guys run around with loaded guns? All I know is something is radically wrong."

He said Posse members have told Tigerton merchants that they don't want to pay state sales tax when buying items. The merchants have responded by saying they won't sell the items until the sales tax is paid.

"I don't know how many (Posse members) are out there. From what I know I'd say there are 50 to 60 of them in the area," he said.

There's much resentment toward the Posse in Tigerton, he added.

"I always get the feeling that if they step out of line here they'd get run out. Just let them pull a caper and get out of control."

The law is the law, he said. It has to be obeyed by all.

The Posse, he said, "gets by with a little bit and pushes and pushes for more until someday something will happen and someone will get killed."

POSSE BACKS BELIEFS WITH PARTS OF BIBLE, CONSTITUTION

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

The Life Science Church, the Basic Bible Church of America, and the Christian Liberty Academy of Tigerton all have ties to the Posse Comitatus.

To say that all Posse members are affiliated with one of the religious groups might be erroneous, but Posse members do cloak themselves with religion. Many of them, including Posse leaders, claim to be ministers in the above named churches, which came into central Wisconsin shortly after the Posse was formed.

The Posse's religious connection is apparent in its members heavy reliance on passages from the Bible. The Bible and the U.S. Constitution are the two documents most used by the Posse to justify its actions and beliefs. References from both are often quoted out of context and passages that do not serve the Posse's purpose are ignored.

For example, the Life Science Church claims that its religious doctrines are based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Yet the church disavows the 16th Amendment to the Constitution, which gives government the right to levy income taxes.

FIFTH IN SERIES

The Basic Bible Church of America bases its doctrines on the Bible, according to Thomas Stockheimer, a Posse leader who claims to be a pastor of the church. In the past, Stockheimer has also claimed affiliation with the Life Science Church.

The Christian Liberty Academy in Tigerton was established as a private Christian school, according to Stockheimer. It started with three students last year and now has 17 students, according to Stockheimer.

The academy is headed by James Wickstrom, who is state information coordinator for the Posse.

Wickstrom also claims the title of minister, but his religious ties didn't stop him from recently telling a gathering in Wausau that the Posse would use firearms against authorities if they attempt to remove a trailer from a town of Easton farm. The trailer was installed illegally and has been ordered removed by a Circuit Court judge.

The trailer is on the farm of C. Leonard Rydell and his two sons. The Rydells deeded their farm to the Life Science Church in 1976, but continued to live on and farm the property. The senior Rydell listed himself as pastor of the church and his home as a parsonage. His two sons, Wayne and Warren are listed as trustees.

Wayne Rydell recently filed several "common law" liens against Marathon County and state officials and others, contending they violated his constitutional rights. Another member of the Life Science Church, Richard Kauffman of Loyal, filed similar liens in Marathon and Clark counties.

Kauffman admits he's a member of the Posse.

The "common law" liens have no legal standing, according to Attorney General Bronson La Follette. Officials believe they are harassment measures.

The filing of the liens was encouraged by Stockheimer, who tells how to do it in a booklet he put out entitled "You Can't Lose, Join up... Join in! Sue the Bastards."

One paragraph in that booklet reads: "When suing public officials put some teeth into the action... file a common law lien on their property and claim a common law writ of attachment on their bank checking and savings accounts. Tie up their property until you get justice!"

Stockheimer signed the booklet as Pastor Thomas Stockheimer of the Basic Bible Church.

The Posse started justifying itself through religion after law enforcement officials disavowed any association with it in the mid 1970s. The group then stopped calling itself the Sheriff's Posse Comitatus and took the name Christian Posse Comitatus.

Donald Minniecheske, a Posse member from Tigerton, said the Posse gets its strength from the nation's founding fathers, who formed a Christian nation.

Any Christian male over 15 years old can join, he said.

When asked if Jews could join, Minniecheske said: "If they are Christians, they could. If they do not believe in Jesus Christ, then they have a problem."

Kauffman took a more narrow view. He said the Posse is necessary to act against a conspiracy that he contends is being formed by bankers, Jews, and the Rockefellers. He said the "conspirators" plan to get rich by selling to both sides during a coming world war which will cause worldwide hunger and chaos.

He said, once the chaos occurs, these people will be able to form a world government under the control of David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Kauffman said the "conspirators" started their work by undermining the American monetary system with the creation of the Federal Reserve System in the 1930s.

He also accused judges and district attorneys of doing "the anti-Christ's work."

During an interview at Tigerton Dells, a resort just outside Tigerton, Kauffman was interrupted by a young woman, who said she hated blacks and hoped they would come to the Tigerton area if there were a war.

He responded by giving her a dose of the Life Science Church philosophy.

"The Bible says you must not have hate in your heart for anyone," Kauffman said. "I don't hate anyone in my heart."

"The Negro has a place in this world. God put them here to be servants to the white Christian."

When asked if he was a member of the Emancipation of the White Seed, a group that attempted to form a chapter in Wausau several years ago, Kauffman said he never heard of the group.

Other Posse members, however, did hear of the White Seed, a group that preaches that black males should be neutered and put in forced labor camps and Jews should be exterminated.

Minniecheske said some Posse members might have joined the White Seed. "What people happen to believe is their privilege," he said. "Everyone is responsible for his own actions."

The Posse draws its members from among different Christian faiths and even has a Catholic priest as a member, according to Minniecheske. He refused to identify the priest, saying members' names were secret.

Posse leaders deny any connection with the White Seed, but some of their followers did join the group. Mike Dodge, son of Posse leader and Basic Bible Church Bishop Charles Dodge of rural Mosinee, for example said he was trying to organize a

White Seed chapter in Marathon County, according to an article from the Madison Capital Times.

A link between the Posse and the White Seed was suggested by Marathon County Sheriff Louis Gianoli who told the Capital Times that some Posse members buy as many as 15,000 rounds of ammunition at once, which would cost more than \$2,000.

Gianoli was quoted as saying: "I've been in law enforcement for 33 years and I know most every one of them (Posse members)."

He said he is certain the Posse is getting supplementary money from somewhere else.

"I had expected the money was coming from Missouri or Tennessee because before the White Seed came in, there wasn't much ammunition buying."

Gianoli told the Herald that he didn't want to discuss at length the Posse's arms purchases because of current tensions with the group. He did say: "We know they are buying ammunition. Nothing says you can't buy it, but they are buying it in large quantities and have illegal firearms such as automatic weapons. (U.S.) Treasury agents know they have the weapons, which is a violation of federal statutes."

POSSE TRIES TO AVOID TAXES

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

Members of the Posse Comitatus like to look upon themselves as superpatriots—except, that is, when it comes to paying taxes.

Many Posse members have been involved in schemes to avoid taxes, efforts that has brought them in conflict with the law.

In some cases, Posse members have been prosecuted. Authorities are still investigating other aspects of their position on taxes.

The Posse's disregard for taxes has ranged from refusal to pay state sales taxes, a complaint heard from Tigerton-area merchants, to elaborate antitax groups headed by Posse members that openly advocate non-payment of taxes.

One of the most notorious Posse leaders, Thomas Stockheimer of Tigerton, has been involved in several of the schemes.

Stockheimer, formerly of Mosinee, was an officer of the Little People's Tax Advisory Committee, a now defunct group that set up an office in Schofield about the same time the Posse was formed.

The committee sold counseling services to people on the filing of tax withholding forms. Clients were encouraged to exaggerate the number of exemptions, which kept their employer from withholding federal taxes on their paychecks.

The early Posse identified closely with the committee. The Posse's little blue book, which contains its basic philosophy, were distributed in the Wausau area with the name of the "Little People's Tax Advisory Committee" stamped on its back cover. The committee then listed a Hewitt post office box in Wood County as its address.

SIXTH IN SERIES

On the inside of the book's back cover was the printed inscription: "The United States of America was founded as a protest against taxation."

Active with Stockheimer in the committee was another Posse member, Charles Dodge, of the Mosinee area. Dodge was convicted on federal tax charges because of his counseling and served time in a federal prison.

Dodge's problems came after he spoke on the withholding scheme to a large crowd in Dubuque, Iowa. Fifteen people took his advice and they were prosecuted by the federal government. The case became known as the Dubuque 15. Stockheimer was indicted

for trying to influence the jurors in the trial, but apparently was not convicted.

Stockheimer did serve time in federal prison in 1977 for assaulting an Internal Revenue Service agent on the Alan Grewe farm in rural Abbotsford in 1974.

Now out of prison, Stockheimer is back lecturing about taxes. He has appeared recently in the West Bend and Janesville areas.

According to the Janesville Gazette, he was assisted in his appearance in that city by Alton Moss, alias John Freeman. Moss was identified as being convicted on five charges of aiding and abetting the fraudulent filing of W-4 forms in Nebraska.

People attending Stockheimer's tax sessions are encouraged to enroll in advance sessions. A "law class" session cost \$200 and includes instructions on tax avoidance procedures. A more advanced "law class" developed by Stockheimer, but not necessarily taught by him, costs \$250. It teaches people how to file common law liens against public officials and enemies and how to avoid paying speeding tickets.

Another of the men who was identified as speaking at the Janesville gatherings was James Wickstrom, who like Stockheimer, claims to be a minister in the Basic Bible Church. Wickstrom, a member of the Posse Comitatus, also heads the Christian Liberty Academy in Tigerton.

The Posse has other means of avoiding taxes. One is known as the Daly-Porth Fifth Amendment tax return, which has filers stamping in the Constitution's Fifth Amendment on every line.

Posse members rely heavily on the amendment's "due process" provision in saying that government cannot take away their property without due process.

The Daly-Porth scheme is named partly after Jerome Daly of Bloomington, Minn., president of the Life Science Church and a director and minister of the Basic Bible Church.

Many of the Posse members also claim to be ministers in one of the two churches. That conveniently allows them to pay less taxes and claim more tax exemptions.

Many take vows of poverty to one of the churches and turn over all their worldly goods and incomes. The church takes care of them financially.

That would follow the practice of many of the established churches, except the Posse-connected church is often a single household, with members of the family assuming roles as pastors and trustees.

Carl Leonard Rydell, a town of Easton farmer, deeded his 150-acre farm to his son, Wayne, in 1975. He did not pay a transfer fee, claiming an exemption because the transfer to a child in return for nominal consideration.

The next day, Wayne transferred the farm to the Order of Almighty God of the Life Science Church. He did not pay a transfer fee either, claiming an exemption that said the real estate was worth less than \$100.

The senior Rydell listed himself as a pastor of the Life Science Church and declared his home a parsonage. His two sons, Wayne and Warren, who live at the farm, became trustees of the church.

The church's charter said all its holdings would remain the property of the chartering church. The mother church would get the property only if it was subsequently given to it. That left the Rydells in complete control of their property.

The deeding of the land to the Life Science Church did not remove it totally from the state's tax rolls. State law exempts only 10 acres of church land. The rest is taxable.

The state of Wisconsin is seeking \$7,825 in unpaid income taxes and interest from Carl

Leonard Rydell for the years 1975 and 1977, and \$2,513 in unpaid income taxes from Warren Rydell for 1977.

Federal income tax officials want \$3,025 from Carl Leonard Rydell for unpaid taxes in 1974-75 and \$3,315 from Warren for unpaid taxes in 1975-76.

Wisconsin officials have begun action to collect the unpaid taxes from Carl Leonard Rydell by having his employer withhold part of his wages.

Sally Minniecheske, wife of Posse member Donald Minniecheske, said that they deeded 27 acres of their farm-resort near Tigerton to the Life Science Church in order to prevent the state from buying their 577-acre site for a park.

It's more difficult to condemn church property, she said.

MARATHON COUNTY TO REFUSE LIENS

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

The Marathon County Register of Deeds has been instructed not to accept any more common law liens.

District Attorney Rand Krueger said Tuesday that he informed Robert Gernetzky, register of deeds, that Gernetzky's office would not violate the law by refusing such liens.

Krueger said he based his instructions on an opinion issued late last week by state Attorney General Bronson La Follette.

The liens were filed against elected officials and other citizens as a means of harassment. The attorney general said that they had no legal standing.

More than 40 common law liens were filed in Marathon County by Wayne Rydell of the town of Easton and Richard Kauffman of rural Loyal. Both men are officers of the Life Science Church, a group with ties to the Posse Comitatus.

Krueger said he didn't think any register of deeds in the state would accept common law liens in view of the attorney general's ruling.

LAST IN SERIES

A request for a declaratory judgment was sought earlier this month in Circuit Court for most of the liens filed in Marathon County. The filers have been given 20 days from the time they receive the notification of the request to respond before a judge acts. If the declaratory judgment is granted the liens would be voided.

Jeffery Drach, county corporation counsel, said today he is considering amendments to the judgment so that people named in liens after the county filed its original documents would be included in the declaratory judgment. The county might also seek affirmative relief, which would remove the liens from the record, he said.

In a test of the attorney general's ruling, a Tigerton man was rebuffed Monday in Antigo when he attempted to file common law liens against property of four Langlade County officials and three attorneys.

Langlade County Register of Deeds Ione Orgeman refused to accept the liens after consulting with District Attorney Carl Buesing.

Larry Copps of Tigerton tried to file seven liens for \$15 million each against the property of Buesing, Circuit Judge Ralph Strandberg, county child support investigator Donald Mollett, county social services director James Koller and attorneys Richard Winter, Charles Avery and Norman Wild.

Copps, who has been involved in a child custody suit, claimed his constitutional rights had been violated.

La Follette has asked the Supreme Court to allow judges to cite persons for contempt of court if they file common law liens against judges, court commissioners, district

attorneys, assistant attorneys general and clerks of court while the filers are defendants in the particular court.

He also asked the court to allow the judges to remain on the case rather than disqualify themselves.

The filing of common law liens in Wisconsin started with filings against court officials. They later spread to other government officials, government employees and citizens.

More than 100 liens have been filed statewide.

OMERNICK SAYS POSSE GROUPS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PROTECT PROPERTY

(By Pat Rupinski, Herald staff)

State Rep. Raymond Omernick, R-Wittenberg, said Monday that unless legislation is enacted that makes the state Department of Natural Resources responsible when it violates someone's constitutional rights, citizens will have little choice but to form groups to protect their property.

"I don't like to see such citizen groups formed because they could take the law into their own hands," he said. "But there is a definite need to give them (citizens) protection over their property."

Omernick said legislation that he is supporting would prohibit district attorneys and the attorney general from defending the DNR if the agency committed "irresponsible acts."

He defined irresponsible acts as violations of someone's constitutional rights.

In response to a series of articles in the Herald on the Posse Comitatus, Omernick said he helped to form the Posse in order to protect his property. The alternative would have been to allow the DNR to prevent him from irrigating his potato crop, which would have forced him into bankruptcy, he said.

Omernick said he stopped attending Posse meetings in 1974-75 after the sheriff refused to support the organization.

Omernick said he is a lifelong Roman Catholic and is not a member of the Life Science Church, although he witnessed the transfer of property in the town of Easton to the Life Science Church in his capacity as a town of Franzen municipal justice.

In a written statement, Omernick said:

"The Sheriff's Posse was formed to assist the sheriff in an emergency and to protect the life and property of the people in the county if the sheriff refuses or fails to do so.

"The sheriff and the district attorney will not protect your life and property in any DNR confrontation. They will defend the DNR instead. It was evident in the '70's when I tried to obtain a permit to divert stored water from a reservoir on the Holt Creek.

"The DNR refused to give me a hearing on the application and then because I did not have a permit, 14 men including sheriff's deputies, hauled off my equipment.

"I cannot obtain water from wells due to the clay in the soil and am dependent on the reservoir for irrigation. There is no protection whatever from this agency. It is why I have introduced legislation to remove this umbrella and make the DNR responsible for its own acts.

"The state has dropped all 11 counts of so-called illegal diversion, has returned all my equipment and under an agreement between Judge (Peter) Seidel (of Taylor County), Rand Krueger, (Marathon County district attorney), Jack Osswald (Omernick's attorney) and myself has allowed me to pump out of the reservoir.

"Unless legislation is enacted to protect the life and property of the people in the state, under present law, the DNR can unlawfully take life and property and the sheriff, district attorney and Attorney Gen-

ral's Office are all obligated to defend the DNR."

Omernick said the sheriff's office called to protect his property when it sided with the DNR in his water diversion dispute in 1978.

After his irrigation equipment was confiscated several times, Omernick had armed men protecting his property.

The men were members of the original Posse and some belong to the new Christian Posse, he said Monday. Last week, Omernick told the Daily Herald that the armed men were his employees.

Omernick said he would use armed men again to protect his irrigation system, but said that he hoped it wouldn't be necessary if he got his legislation enacted.

"If I am faced with the same alternatives as last time, I will do it (use armed men) again," he said. "I have to in order to pump from the reservoir if I plant potatoes."

Omernick said he did not see anything wrong with some Posse member's training in military maneuvers, building tunnels and bunkers and buying arms. "They're just protecting their property for something that might happen," he said.

Posse member Thomas Stockheimer, now living in Tigerton, said last week that the Posse was taking the military-related action to be prepared if there's a war.

Omernick said the major question in the controversy surrounding the C. Leonard Rydell farm in the town of Easton is whether a town ordinance on zoning is violating Rydell's constitutional rights.

"It's up to the courts to decide," he said. "If it (Rydell's property) is a valid church, does a town have jurisdiction over it?"

TRIBUTE TO TOM STEED

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1980

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take this occasion to express my friendship and good wishes to TOM STEED, who recently announced that he has decided to step down from Congress after 32 years of service.

TOM has been an able representative of the people of the Fourth District of Oklahoma, and has been a major force in developing Federal budgets for key Government services. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, he has a reputation as a tough inquisitor, but a fair and honest arbiter.

I have served with TOM here in the House for nearly a decade, and have come to admire him most for his leadership abilities and his fundamental understanding of the legislative process. Though I will miss him greatly, I will always remember my association with him. I join my colleagues in wishing him the very best in the years ahead.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS—THEY STILL DO NOT WORK

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial written by Robert M. Bleiberg which appeared in the March 3, 1980, issue of Barron's. Mr. Bleiberg points out that wage and price controls have never produced anything positive, unless one considers dislocations in the economy and false shortages as positive steps toward fighting inflation. Unfortunately, the White House is once again considering the imposition of wage and price controls, and we see the Council on Wage and Price Stability cranking up for action. Hopefully, as Bleiberg puts it, we will not be fooled again into thinking that this approach of controls will solve our problems of high inflation and high interest rates. I urge my colleagues to read this insightful column so that we will not repeat some earlier mistakes which have cost our economy dearly. Mr. Bleiberg's editorial reads as follows:

HAMMURABI TO BOSWORTH: GUIDELINES OR CONTROLS HAVE NEVER STOPPED INFLATION

Lucky Pierre. For nearly a decade, at least in our book, the renowned Dr. Rinfret has been the economist whose name leaped to mind when the issue of wage and price controls came up. On this score, for what we hope will be the last time, we remind our readers of how enthusiastically the good doctor greeted the advent in mid-August 1971 of President Nixon's move to impose them. "No one could ask for more. I support the program. I applaud the program. I have a sense of joy and elation." And so on and so forth. At long last, however, Pierre Rinfret is off the hook. With the rate of inflation in this country seemingly approaching the runaway stage, other economists, albeit less effusively and in far more guarded terms lately have raised the cry for controls.

At least two, Barry P. Bosworth and Bruce K. MacLaury, hall from the Brookings Institution, which, in view of its recent contributions to the national well-being, should probably be rated a disaster area. Thus, MacLaury, who rejoices in the presidency of Brookings, recently told the New York Financial Writers Association that while he hates controls, they may not be a necessary evil. His Senior Fellow, who once headed the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability, has gone his boss one better—or worse. Described by those who knew him when as someone "in love with incomes policies," Bosworth has come out of the closet. Once content with advocating voluntary restraints, he now boldly urges the imposition of mandatory curbs.

The Fellow from Brookings went public with his new position early last month, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, as well as in a subsequent interview with the press. His official statement carries the customary disclaimer and warning label: "The

views expressed herein are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of Brookings staff members or the officers and trustees of the Brookings Institution." Those are the least murky sentences in 20 pages of turgid prose. Yet the thrust is unmistakable. "There is no policy that can break the current momentum of the wage-price spiral without high costs. . . . Given a desire to slow inflation, the choice is rapidly being reduced to one of severe recession versus wage-price controls."

Then Mr. Bosworth hinted at his own preference. "Past experience," he told the lawmakers, "indicates the major problems and risks of controls. But the lessons learned in those periods can also be used to avoid some of the problems." In the interview with a Washington daily, the former price stabilizer made his position clearer, notably on the prospects of avoiding previous mistakes, to the point where the Money Manager recently dubbed him a "Born-again advocate of mandatory controls."

Born again or born yesterday? P. T. Barnum said there's one born every minute, and he probably never even heard of Brookings. Be that as it may, Barry Bosworth is undoubtedly right about one thing: that "past experience" (the best kind) "indicates the major problems and risks of controls." For example, under Nixon's half-dozen freezes and phases, the U.S. economy suffered the classic syndrome of disturbance and abuse, notably wasted resources, artificial shortages, and lowered incentives to produce and to invest. By the time the counter-productive program was finally phased out, the country had seen its currency plunged into debasement, while inflation, at the outset a relatively sedate 4-5 percent, was raging at a double-digit rate.

By the same token, during the Korean War—which Walter Heller the other day baldly cited on the plus side of the historic ledger—controls were imposed so late in the day that they had scant effect. Transactions prices across-the-board soon declined, and stayed, below ceilings, thereby rendering them meaningless, while the companion authority, to allocate raw materials, led both the public and private sectors into a long and costly series of investment blunders. And, to judge by the carefully documented work, Forty Centuries of Wage and Price Controls, by Robert Schuettinger and Eamonn Butler, it was ever thus.

As to learning from experience, the four millennia record, from Hammurabi and Diodorus, to let us say, Barry Bosworth, strikes us as all but blank. For under Bosworth and his successor, the incumbent R. Robert Russell, the Council on Wage and Price Stability, though operating on a limited mandate, has proceeded to make every mistake in the book. The Council has set standards that are unrealistically low, and then, through the exercise of what has come to be known scathingly as "guideline arithmetic," granted special dispensation to a favored few. It has cracked down on producers of such strategic raw materials as diesel fuel and aluminum, thereby diverting output from its customary channels and worsening shortages. It has intruded time and again into negotiations between management and labor, usually with the effect of either dragging out the talks interminably or triggering their breakdown. Without a shred of legal sanction—the guidelines, after all, are "voluntary"—it has jawboned, manipulated and coerced the Fortune 500, just as in the bad old days of LBJ and JFK, into complying with its dictates. All the

while, needless to add, owing to unbridled deficits in the federal budget and excessively easy credit policy, inflation has accelerated to a pace more appropriate to a banana republic. Evidently, statisticians never learn.

But they never give up. The Council on Wage and Price Stability, to illustrate, dates back to early 1974, when, after the Nixon economic debacle and on the eve of total decontrol, the Senate, in an apparent effort to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, approved it by a single vote. Once assailed by the late Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.) as a "toothless tiger in an economic jungle of commodity speculators, oil country wheeler-dealers and Latin American sugar barons," the Council was endowed all-too-soon with fang and claw. Specifically, in the fall of 1978, when the White House unveiled its own so-called Phase Two anti-inflationary program, it was told to focus on the price and wage decisions of approximately 400 large corporations, primarily those with yearly sales in excess of \$500 million (since broadened to 1,500 or so concerns with volume topping \$250 million). "The Council has the statutory authority to obtain, where necessary, the required information on prices, profits and wage rates. It will use that authority to identify publicly areas of the economy and firms in which compliance to [sic] the standard is not being achieved." To handle its expanded duties, it also won a fourfold increase in appropriations and a fivefold increase in staff.

What a negative return on investment. Barry Bosworth, who ought to know, told the Senate Subcommittee that "voluntary incomes programs have lost their credibility." Which is not to say that the Council has been idle. On the contrary, thanks largely to its efforts, agriculture and industry have been hamstrung by shortages of diesel fuel and aluminum. Though freed from ceilings by the Department of Energy in 1976, diesel fuel, in effect, was recon- trolled (voluntarily, of course) last year by COWPS (pronounced cops), which neglected to tell the oil companies how much they could charge. Re-enter DOE and its infamous system of allocations, which first threatened to deprive farmers in the Midwest of enough fuel to run their tractors and subsequently wound up halting the flow to such supposedly less essential users as transit authorities and truckers.

As to aluminum, it is bought and sold abroad, as well as at home. On the world market, aluminum ingot currently commands a price of roughly \$1 per pound, compared to the 66 cents which the guidelines "allow" domestic producers to charge. To nobody's surprise—except, perhaps, that of the Council—more and more tonnage has been flowing to customers overseas, leaving domestic users to scramble for a dwindling supply. Controls, as their proponents have always maintained, do work miracles: in the twinkling of an eye, they can make things disappear.

Dislocations and shortages—they're just for openers. Because of the Council's clumsy thrusts, the Rubber Workers, who had all but reached agreement with the industry last spring, angrily went out on strike. (In a remarkable display of spinelessness, the producers, who made too generous a settlement with the union, have even agreed to refrain from passing on to consumers that part of the pay raise that exceeds the guidelines.) Council intervention also helped turn the walkout at United Airlines into a two-month confrontation. Settlements reached by the Teamsters and United Auto Workers, though far in excess

of the approved standards, won an official nod via "guideline arithmetic," where by rigging the computers, two and two, including such fringe benefits as cost-of-living adjustments, were made to come out to three or less. Companies have popped on and off the Council's public enemies list, and several, notably Sears, have been coerced into lowering prices. All the while, of course, the twin engines of inflation, the Treasury and Fed, have been revving up to higher and higher rates. Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice—or time after time—and you, too, can be a Brookings Senior Fellow. ●

VOLUNTARY MILITARY AID TO THE AFGHANS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, John Snyder, director of public affairs for the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, on whose National Advisory Council I am proud to serve, recently sent a letter to the President. In it, Mr. Snyder asks for Government regulations to be changed so that individual American citizens might send small arms to the Afghans fighting Soviet aggression.

This kind of voluntary military aid is in the best traditions of our country, and I urge the President to agree to Mr. Snyder's request.

I would like to call the text of the whole letter to my colleagues attention, in hopes that they will also urge the President to allow this program to go forward:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE
RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS,
Washington, February 19, 1980.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since it is the policy of the United States Government to oppose violations of human rights throughout the world; and

Since the Communist Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has violated the human rights of the people of Afghanistan by its military invasion of that Nation on Christmas Day, 1979; and

Since that invasion continues to the present; and

Since the United States Government has opposed and condemned that invasion; and

Since the God-worshipping, freedom-loving people of Afghanistan are fighting the god-less Communist invaders with whatever means are at their disposal; and

Since these Afghans have, according to recent press reports, requested small arms with which to fight the despotic Communists; and

Since tens of millions of law-abiding American citizens own firearms which could be used to resist armed invaders; and

Since American citizens have, in years past, acted in individual capacities by giving individual firearms to citizens of other Nations threatened with armed invasion; and

Since, therefore, there is a tradition of armed American civilians giving of their plenty to freedom fighters in need of arms with which to defend themselves; but

Since, under present regulations, armed American civilians can not simply give and transport individual gifts of arms to civilians of other Nations;

We call upon you to lift these regulations with regard to anti-Communist Afghans and, thus, allow law-abiding armed American civilians, should they so choose, to give firearms to these Afghans so that they may fight the Red Menace.

We would appreciate the honor of a reply with your reaction to this suggestion.

Cordially and sincerely,

John M. Snyder. ●

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SHOULD STRIKE DRAFT REGISTRATION FUNDS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter I sent to the members of the Appropriations Committee today urging them to vote against the administration's request for supplemental 1980 funds to establish pre-mobilization draft registration.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1980.

This week the Appropriations Committee will be voting on the administration's request for supplemental 1980 funds to reinstitute pre-mobilization draft registration.

I urge you to vote against the administration's request and to vote instead for the "Rostker plan," which beefs up the Selective Service System and calls for post-mobilization registration.

The essential difference between the administration's plan and Rostker plan is that the former will deliver inductees to training camps 10 days from mobilization, (M+10), while the latter will deliver inductees 17 days from mobilization, (M+17). Both plans include provisions for registration.

The seven day difference between the two plans is irrelevant for two reasons.

First, the Department of Defense is not geared to accept the first inductee into training until 30 days from mobilization, (M+30). Thus, both plans exceed DOD requirements.

Second, neither plan takes into account enlistments. Yet whenever the country has had to mobilize in the past, the military has been flooded with enlistees—from the first day of mobilization, (M+0), forward! (Indeed, at the start of World War I enlistments had to be suspended because the influx of enlistees and draftees overwhelmed our training capabilities.)

The basic arguments against the administration's pre-mobilization registration plan are these:

A perfectly acceptable alternative exists, the Rostker plan, which exceeds DOD requirements, and costs millions less.

Draft registration will create a huge SSS bureaucracy, along with record-keeping, surveillance, and law enforcement activities.

A computer listing of the largely unskilled 18 year-old population, which is all that

would result from pre-mobilization registration, is not what our military needs. It is a World War II answer to a 1980's situation. Even DOD Secretary Brown has conceded that registration is irrelevant to our current military personnel needs.

Our major need is to retain skilled, experienced personnel in the military. Pre-mobilization registration will have no effect on this need.

During World War I and World War II more than 10 million men were registered in a single day. Yet the administration is arguing that today, with computers and faster communications, we can't match that capability.

Peacetime registration runs against American tradition and principles.

The constitutionality of a males-only draft registration is open to serious question. Lawsuits are inevitable and even administration reports indicate the outcome of any such lawsuits would be uncertain.

If the main purpose of pre-mobilization registration is to help secure the Persian Gulf, it behooves the administration to ask our allies to start rolling up their sleeves. American youth should not have to bear the burden for defending Japan and Europe's oil lines.

President Carter has stated that draft registration is a symbol. But it is a symbol without substance. And the flurry of debate over draft registration has caused us to forget that there are alternatives.

If we want to send a message, we should reduce our dependence on foreign oil. How many times does the obvious have to be repeated?

The All Volunteer Force does have a problem retaining skilled, experienced personnel. We spend five years and a million dollars training an Air Force pilot. Pre-mobilization registration will not provide us with pilots. We need to look at measures designed to retain skilled level career people.

Strengthening and upgrading the National Guard and Reserve Forces is a more efficient, quicker way to increase our military preparedness.

The administration's pre-mobilization registration plan reminds me of H. L. Mencken's observation that "A new fallacy in politics spreads faster in the United States than anywhere else on earth." The administration is trying to prove Mencken right, but the Congress doesn't have to go along.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,
Congresswoman. ●

STUDY FINDS EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CONTINUES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, as an outspoken advocate of a more active U.S. role in resolving the conflict in Northern Ireland, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report recently issued by the Fair Employment Agency for Northern Ireland, which is the official Government body in Ulster assigned the responsibility of fighting discrimination for religious or political reasons.

I am sorry to say the report indicates that Northern Ireland's Catholics have moved further down the social scale relative to Protestants.

Earlier reports indicated that the unemployment rate for Catholics was 2½ times that for Protestants. The high discrepancy in unemployment rates in the past had been blamed on the former Unionist government, the Protestant ruling party. However, this new report released in February 1980, indicates that no change in employment patterns has occurred since the Government of Great Britain assumed direct responsibility for ruling Northern Ireland in 1972. This trend is a far cry from what we have been led to believe by British spokesmen in recent years.

An even gloomier aspect of the report indicates that the occupational disparities between Catholics and Protestants will persist and most likely widen unless the Government undertakes strong and constructive policies. The belief that time will cure the inequities, the report concludes, will remain ineffective in solving the problem.

The agency's investigations show that virtual segregation exists in many occupations and that some firms have what amounts to a policy of apartheid, with Catholics employed in only one department of the company, separated from their Protestant coworkers. In addition, Catholics are far underrepresented in skilled occupations such as engineering, banking and business.

The agency's director, Robert Cooper, has indicated that a program similar to the American affirmative action plan is necessary to alleviate the employment discrepancy.

Mr. Speaker, this detailed study is another indication that discrimination against the Catholic minority in Ulster, and the overall deprivation of civil and human rights by British authorities, continues unabated in Northern Ireland. The fact that the study was conducted by an agency of the Northern Ireland Government lends veracity to the seriousness of the problem.

I remain convinced that terrorist violence is not the root of the Ulster conflict, but a result of the underlying policies of discrimination and denial of civil rights imposed by the Protestant majority. While I join in condemning all violence in Ulster, we must realize that terrorism will not be stamped out until the underlying causes for the violence have been remedied.

I remain convinced that the U.S. Government can play an instrumental role in encouraging a peaceful settlement to the Ulster conflict, a conflict that has claimed more than 2,000 lives. It is my belief, and the feelings of my fellow members of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, that neither the United States nor any other nation attempt to impose a solution to the strife. That question can only be answered by the people of Ireland—the people of all of Ireland.

I am encouraged by Irish Prime Minister Haughey's recent statement inviting an international conference, including participation by the United

States, on the Ulster question. The Fair Employment Agency's report is a clear indication that the situation in Northern Ireland is not improving, but getting worse. I will continue with my efforts in encouraging increased participation by the U.S. Government on the Irish issue, and I urge my colleagues to join in this effort. ●

COOPERSBURG: A TOWN OF POSSIBILITIES WITH A RICH HISTORY

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the borough of Coopersburg, a proud community of 3,000 people nestled in the southern end of Lehigh County, Pa., recently observed its 100th anniversary.

This lovely small town is typical of communities across the Nation in that it personifies the faith settlers had in this great Nation and their perseverance in building better communities through sweat, toil, and hardship. Such efforts and sacrifices merit our warmest praise and congratulations.

Such efforts are reflective of today's Coopersburg as well, where a hard-working population symbolizes the best of American family values and community spirit. My family and I have personally shared in the quality and substance of Coopersburg life.

The story of Coopersburg is truly the story of America. Although Coopersburg was not incorporated until December 2, 1879, its roots trace back more than a century.

It is a story worth telling, a story which all of us can relate to in our own community pride.

As early as 1740, there was a log tavern, Der Siebenstern, in the wilderness bordering the Saucon Creek on the site now known as Coopersburg. The Lenni-Lenape Indians enjoyed good hunting and fishing and their foot trails crisscrossed the area. The Bachman log tavern was built on one of these trails, 1 day's journey from the Bethlehem Moravian settlement to the north.

Moravians were thrifty people who made long journeys to Philadelphia to sell their wares, purchase raw materials coming from Europe, and share their culture. Farms owned by German settlers dotted the area between Bethlehem and this lovely log tavern at Coopersburg. These farmers had already set up churches which doubled as schools. The Saucon Mennonite Church was reasonably close to the tavern and the settlement grew.

By 1800 Joseph Frey came onto the scene and the foot trail, once only wide enough for a horse, became a wagon and stagecoach road. Mr. Frey built a mill and a gin distillery along the fast-flowing Saucon Creek and joined blacksmiths, wheelwrights, and

other tradesmen who were thriving with the stagecoach stop trade at the tavern. By this time, the stopover was called Freyburg. The area now known as Coopersburg was designated as Bucks County. In 1752 it was incorporated into Northampton County and in 1812 was included in Lehigh County. Mr. Frey became actively interested in politics and served in the State legislature and in Congress.

In 1775, Daniel Cooper, a cooper by trade from Amsterdam, settled in Freyburg, purchased Mr. Frey's tavern and much acreage. A son, Peter, became a builder of stone hotels, stores, and several permanent dwellings still in use 150 years later. He was so beloved by the citizens of Freyburg that in 1832 the village was named Coopersburg.

The steady growth of the village was like that of many other villages of that period. Many persons' efforts strengthened the spirit of the town and on December 2, 1879, the borough was severed from Upper Saucon Township and became incorporated.

Genaah Jordan, who came here as a boy in 1861, was instrumental in setting up that early government. A self-taught draftsman, he fashioned and built homes, many of which are still in use. He saw the need to form a school board and have an English-spoken school. He designed St. John's U.C.C. Church, 1889; the Coopersburg Elementary School building, 1909; First National Bank, 1923; and the present town hall, 1930. He was the burgess at four various times, the last being in his 94th year.

There were also the Coopers. Charles, the son of Peter, was first superintendent of schools in Lehigh County. Thomas was a physician, and his son Tilghman S., became the cattle king of Coopersburg.

Tilghman S. Cooper was interested in bettering the quality of milk. After much research, he traveled to the Isle of Jersey off the coast of England in the English Channel to study at first-hand the Jersey cow, which gave unusually high rich butterfat readings for milk. In 1874, cattle pastured on his Coopersburg farm were sold in New York City's Madison Square Garden. By 1900, it was decided to have the sales in Coopersburg. The cattle came to New York and were taken to the Cooper Farm where they were prepared for sale day on Memorial Day. This sale was a great boost to the town's economy. The sales pavilion, which attracted Jersey cattle lovers, breeders, and buyers from all over the United States and New Zealand, has been accepted in the National Register of Historic Sites.

Another dynamic personality was Dr. Martin Baye, a chemist who discovered TNT, and who purchased a home in Coopersburg.

The Samuel Kern family also left its strong imprint on the area. They were the builders of the famous Kern custom carriages and sleds. The younger generation of the Kerns went on

to horseless carriages. At present, Kenneth (Dutch) Kern, 77, is restoring Franklin cars. His name as a restorer is well known around the country.

More recently, Coopersburg has also been a focal point in the quarrying of black granite in a strong vein 1 mile east of the community. The three Riu brothers and their families settled here from Italy. Knowledgeable about stone, they were able to remove the granite, bring it to the granite works near the railroad in Coopersburg, and transform it into tombstones and ornamental pieces.

One of the brothers, Victor, trained in Italy, became renowned as a sculptor of black granite, which is far more dense and difficult to work than other stone. His pieces were sought after by the art museum at Philadelphia, the Allentown, Pa., public library art collection and the Washington Zoo, among others.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Coopersburg is a proud part of our Nation's heritage, and all citizens of the Lehigh Valley join in honoring the men and women who, decade after decade, built with their hard work and good citizenship, a beautiful community to cherish and to be proud of. ●

LOBBYING WITH APPROPRIATED MONEYS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything about this bill until my office received a call from a Dr. Don Sherk at the Treasury Department about it. Dr. Sherk, whose telephone number is 566-2173, opened the conversation, a conversation he had initiated, by asking my legislative assistant whether "the Congressman" had taken a look at the bill. My assistant informed Dr. Sherk that indeed I had; in fact, I had filed dissenting views on the bill when it came out of the House Banking Committee. Dr. Sherk was unaware of this, but indicated that he would take a look at them.

Then without any prompting from my assistant, Dr. Sherk proceeded to try to "turn this around," to use his phraseology. What this meant is that this Dr. Sherk proceeded to give my assistant figures allegedly showing how much Texas banks and businesses have profited and stand to profit if this bill goes through. At that point my assistant asked Dr. Sherk whether I was the only Member whose office was being called on this bill, or whether other offices were being called. Dr. Sherk replied that I was not alone, but that he had called and would be calling other Members.

At that, my assistant asked Dr. Sherk whether he understood that what he was doing was illegal. This

surprised the doctor, and he maintained that he was simply educating us about the bill, not lobbying for it. I strongly disagree. This administration repeatedly has violated the law by lobbying Members of Congress, and I am tired of it. I think some action should be taken by the Congress to stop this illegal diversion of the taxpayers' funds.

The bill extract follows:

SECTION 1913—LOBBYING WITH APPROPRIATED MONEYS

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 792. ●

U.N. RESOLUTION CONDEMNED

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Security Council recently revealed its insensitivity to Israel's security needs in its resolution condemning the civilian settlements in the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Just as the United States needs its bases throughout the world in order to protect its national security, so too does Israel need at least some outpost settlement for its security. As Michael Shiloh, a spokesman for Israel's Foreign Ministry, said:

Settlement in the West Bank is not only a right but an integral part of our security system.

The U.N. Security Council's one-sided resolution concerns part of the territory which was part of the British mandate of Palestine. In 1977, Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton stated before two subcommittees that "the question of sovereignty has not been finally resolved." The terms of the final settlement have yet to be dictated. It is not for the United States to dictate those terms, instead, it is for those nations directly involved.

It is therefore with great disappointment that I learned of the U.S. support of the Security Council measure. Today the administration announced that they had made a mistake in voting for the resolution—what the President really wanted to do was to abstain. The international implications of such a mistake are staggering. However, the reasons that the administration wished to abstain had to do with mention of Jerusalem. Their opposition to settlements on the West Bank was the source of their support for this resolution and, I believe, their more serious mistake. The peace process going on between Israel and Egypt is a delicate one, and a resolution such as this can only hinder it. Furthermore, I am even more disappointed that the United States believes that Israel's settlement policy is a violation of international law. The areas in question are unallocated areas of the British mandate. Israel is in no way violating any international law in settling on those areas. If anyone has ever been in violation of international law, it would be the Jordanians who seized lands in 1948. The boundaries set up by the 1949 armistice, referred to in U.N. Resolution 242, never constituted internationally recognized borders, and have never been recognized by any nations except Pakistan and the United Kingdom.

The dream of Israel and of all who gave their lives for that dream should not be ruined by a declaration which is unjustified and unrealistic. To deny Israel the right to defend its borders is a violation of rights, one which we should never permit to occur. The resolution is an impediment to peace, and an outrage to the Jewish community in our Nation as well as to the State of Israel.

The Balfour Declaration and almost all subsequent documents concerning the lands of Palestine have been made by outside powers, by people who often could make no claims to the lands. It is time that Israel and her neighbors do their own negotiating, for it is only those nations who can decide their fate.

I think it is appropriate at this point to quote the Bible:

For Zion's Sake, I will not keep silent and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest * * *—Isaiah 62:1

And for the sake of this great Nation of ours, I will continue, unabated, my opposition.●

SUPPORT SUNSET H.R. 2

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice in support of H.R. 2, the sunset legislation introduced by Mr. BLANCHARD, a bill designed to insure that Congress keep a careful watch over the spending of tax dollars.

In recent years there has been growing public dissatisfaction with the efficiency, responsiveness, and skyrocketing expense of our Federal Government. In response, the Congress has been asked to consider a number of bills mandating periodic review of Government operations and programs. In so doing, we will find those programs which have outlived their usefulness, and discontinue them.

There are currently several laws and rules in effect which are designed to encourage effective program review. It seems clear that they are simply not doing the job, and that the time has come for a bill which includes specific enforcement mechanisms.

I believe that H.R. 2, the Sunset Act of 1979, would accomplish this by terminating spending authority for those programs which have not been reviewed. However, there are provisions to prevent the unintentional termination of a program by extended debate on reauthorization.

Opponents of sunset legislation usually base their argument on the question of feasibility. I believe this bill will insure systematic and meaningful oversight by establishing detailed procedures for committees to conduct extensive and comprehensive examinations of programs. This includes much-needed procedures for review and reauthorization of tax expenditures. It also requires programs of a related nature to be reviewed at the same time and in relation to each other. Significantly, the bill exempts from the review process those programs into which citizens have paid in expectation of a later return, such as social security and pension funds.

In addition, Government accountability is insured by a requirement that the President submit management reports assessing the effectiveness of programs, along with a ranking of them relative to other programs. He must also submit periodic evaluations of all regulatory agencies, along with plans for their reorganization and improvement.

I believe it is imperative that we enact a sunset bill that is action-producing, including the specific enforcement mechanisms outlined in H.R. 2. I urge the support of all my colleagues for the swift passage of this legislation.●

RUSSIA AND THE BIG LIE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a column by the Reverend Andrew M. Greeley, the widely circulated syndicated columnist, entitled "Russia and the Big Lie," appeared in the March 11 edition of the Washington Weekly. I insert this column into the RECORD, and especially commend it to the attention of the White House, perhaps

to be read personally by the President, so that it may save him from further deceptions by the Soviets.

The article follows:

RUSSIA AND THE BIG LIE

(By Andrew M. Greeley)

The Olympics are part of the Big Lie—the Biggest Lie perhaps in the history of humankind. The Lie is that Communist Russia is not the most evil government the world has ever known, more evil even than Hitler's Germany, if only because of the duration of its crimes.

The evil is not that the International Olympic Committee is going ahead with the games in Moscow; the crime is that the contests were ever scheduled there in the first place. Since 1945 Russia has violated most of the Olympic professionalization rules and has used the games as an occasion for political propaganda. Still the Olympic Committee has bought the big lie that Russia is like any other government in the world.

South Africa was thrown out of international competition because it is a racist regime. Russia dominates more non-white people than does South Africa—twice as many in fact. Black citizens in South Africa have more personal and political freedom than does anyone in the Soviet Union. To schedule the games in Moscow while throwing out South Africa is the Big Lie. When "liberals" and "black leaders" remain silent in the face of this monstrosity they were guilty of going along with the Big Lie—long before Afghanistan.

The Russians are using nerve gas in Afghanistan and massacred 1,000 men in one village. "World public opinion"—so outraged by the My Lai massacre—remains silent. The latter was an isolated incident against government policy. Massacre in Afghanistan is official policy. To remain silent, as most of our leftists seem to be willing to do, is to succumb to the Big Lie.

Some people I know discount the atrocities in Afghanistan. The Russians wouldn't do something like that. The Big Lie makes them forget how often mass murder was official policy during the bloody history of Communist Russia. The Polish officers who were butchered in the Katyn forest have been quickly forgotten.

To ship grain, sell technology, attend summit meetings and pretend that Russia belongs in the community of civilized nations is part of the Big Lie. Similarly, the argument, frequently heard from columnists, college professors and other intellectuals through the past 50 years, that the evils of Russian communism and American capitalism are roughly equal is a monumental surrender to the Big Lie.

Disarmament agreements, Helsinki pacts, cultural exchanges, international athletic competitions and all other such legitimations of Russian tyranny are the Big Lie. The United States ought to have nothing to do with Russia, other than maintain military might so as to be able to resist its eventual attacks (which is quite different from Mr. Carter's alternation between appeasement and war-psychosis bluster for re-election purposes).

To pretend that the Cold War is over or could be over is the Big Lie. To involve Russia in the international community by doing business with it and to prop up its sick economy are both capitulations to the Big Lie. The life expectancy rate for men in Russia is declining; a quarter of the population may be alcoholics. The regime is tottering—weakened by senility and tyranny. Instead of letting it collapse (as I predict it will in the next decade) of its own dead weight, the United States has helped it stay in power. We have become victims of the

Big Lie we ourselves have helped to propagate.

Ever since Lincoln Steffans went to Russia in 1919 and announced that he had seen the future and it worked, a certain kind of American has been telling the Big Lie about Russia. One would like to think that Afghanistan would put an end to the Lie.

It won't.●

SHAREHOLDERS OF THE BIG OIL COMPANIES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, politicians every day blast the big oil companies.

I wonder if folks know who owns the big oil companies. I had my staff make a survey to determine who owned the oil companies. One person said the U.S. Senators, another, the Arabs, many said foreigners, one said Exxon owns them all, another said New York banks. The few who said stockholders did not know who the stockholders were.

The best breakdown I have on oil companies is from a speech by Frank Ikard of API a few years ago. He analyzed the six largest oil companies and the ratio is comparable today. Let us take these six companies.

There are 2,300,000 direct owners; 54 percent are women, 46 percent are retired at an average age of 70. Their oil dividends are important to their living.

Let us look at the 11,766,000 indirect owners. The largest group are people participating in pension funds. Money that they at first pay into pension funds, and later receive as benefits, is invested in the six oil companies. So it is with mutual fund investors, the next largest group. The remaining owners are investors in insurance companies and brokerage houses and trustees of people's estates, all of whom buy oil company shares as well as other stocks and bonds.

Many blue-collar and white-collar workers own shares directly and indirectly. Some of our retired or widowed friends and relatives own shares. Maybe our parents are using oil dividends to pay for their grandchildren's dental work or education or car for work. Among all these owners we see no evil powers that are supposed to be enemies of the consumer and the poor.

The media is also quick to attack oil companies and their earnings. It is very revealing to note how much more profitable the media is than the oil companies. Ten major media companies averaged 19 percent return on their total capital in the 12 months ending September 30, 1979. In that same period, eight major oil companies averaged 13.1 percent return on total capital. In other words, the total return of the oil companies barely matched the rate of inflation. Out of their return they were setting aside a major part to

reinvest in the business. Oil shareholders got only what was left. It is also interesting to know that every time a shareholder receives \$1 that government through taxes gets \$12. That is \$12 in taxes for each \$1 in dividends.

It is time for the majority party in this House to recognize the harmful effects that their policies are forcing on our U.S. oil companies. Years of price control and heavy taxes have constricted investment in domestic oil production, created an energy crisis, enriched foreign OPEC suppliers of oil, and brought a financial crisis upon this country.

Our country has too much government, more regulations than we need, and more taxes being passed on to the people than they can afford to pay.●

SUPPORT FOR TUNISIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 282, expressing U.S. support for Tunisia. House Concurrent Resolution 282, introduced on February 20 by 14 members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee including Chairman ZABLOCKI, expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should take concrete steps to help Tunisia meet unprovoked threats to its freedom and security. As Members of the House will remember, it was little over 1 month ago, on January 27, that an armed attack against the Tunisian town of Gafsa occurred. The attackers, whom evidence indicates were inspired and perhaps trained by the regime of Colonel Qaddafi in Libya, were unsuccessful in their attempt to seize Gafsa and rally the population around them. I believe that it is a tribute to the government of President Bourguiba which has achieved impressive progress in economic growth and equitable distribution of economic benefits for the people of Tunisia that the citizens of Gafsa helped to repel the attack on their town.

The resolution states that recent attempts to undermine the stability of Tunisia constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and to U.S. national security interests in the Mediterranean area. It is for these reasons that the resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should furnish appropriate levels of economic and security assistance to Tunisia. As my colleagues know, we have already responded to the threat to Tunisia by committing ourselves to supply limited numbers of armored personnel carriers and helicopters to Tunisia. I would also observe that President Carter, aside from approving these sales to Tunisia, met with President Bourguiba's son 3 days ago and said on that occasion that the United States viewed any

threat to the independence and freedom of the people of Tunisia with deep concern. This resolution will serve as a proper congressional statement affirming the unity of the U.S. Government in our support for Tunisia.

Tunisia is a nation which has been a good friend of the United States in the North African region. Tunisia deserves our strong support, not only for the sake of our own national interests but primarily for the sake of the Tunisian people themselves. I would urge my colleagues to support the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 282, and I would hope that the Senate will also soon pass its companion resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 78.●

HANDGUN MISUSE CLAIMS 612 LIVES IN JANUARY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January 1980, 612 Americans were killed by handguns. This figure represents a compilation of media reported handgun deaths from cities and towns across the Nation, collected by Handgun Control, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, a new Gallup poll released on February 3 indicates overwhelming support for new handgun controls—even among gun owners. The poll found that 75 percent of the electorate wants tougher licensing laws, including 65 percent of the Nation's gun owners.

Over 30 Members of the House have cosponsored the Handgun Crime Control Act of 1979 which would ban the sale of Saturday night specials and other easily concealable handguns. It would require greater accountability by handgun importers, manufacturers, and dealers.

The Congress has the responsibility to act on this much needed and desired legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the Handgun Crime Control Act of 1979 and stop the handgun misuse that continues to claim so many lives. The handgun body count follows:

ROLL OF HANDGUN DEAD JANUARY 1980

ALABAMA (22)

Roy Eugene Bailey, Hanceville; William H. Brown, Roanoke; Geneva Clemons, Athens; Daniel Drumgood, Tuscumbia; Lila Hodges, Birmingham; Michael Johnson, Athens; Hoyt Lathan, Joppa; Glover Merriweather, Birmingham; Bobby Mitchell, Florence; Eugene Rau, Mobile; Archie Reese, Birmingham; Floy Roberts, Mars Hill; James Roberts, Mars Hill; Maybelle Roberts, Mars Hill; Ukle Smith, Roanoke; Linda Speese, Mobile; Gerald Speese, Mobile; Leonard Stafford, Mobile; Douglas Thompson, Mobile; Freddie Thompson, Birmingham; Nell Tidmore, Dadeville; and Charles Vaughn, Peach Corner.

ARIZONA (8)

David Benzor, Yuma; Bobby Curran, Phoenix; Robert Hunter, Tucson; David Mendivil, Tempe; Ernesto Ruiz, Yuma; Monse Salano, Phoenix; Daniel Taccit, Phoenix; and Unidentified Male, 50, Yuma.

ARKANSAS (7)

Jerald Bell, Tontitown; Mildred Ditlow, Little Rock; Helen Green, Pine Bluff; Kevin Johnson, Little Rock; Mike Sanders, Stamp; James Smith, Mandeville; and Michael Trice, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA (95)

Arthur Albidrez, Riverside; Paul Anderson, Long Beach; Randall Andrews, Eureka; Jimmy Armijo, Santa Barbara; Addie Ashley, Los Angeles; Jerry Bailey, Sunland; Michael Ballman, Oceanside; Masood Barin, San Diego; Roy Bracamone, San Jose; John Brown, Bakersfield; Craig Butler, Hawthorne; Arthur Carmona, Garden Grove; Earnestine Clevenger, Soda Springs; Daniel Coalson, Huntington Beach; Clista Crews, San Rafael; Donald Crews, San Rafael; Camillo Cuellar, San Bernardino; James Curmett, Los Angeles; Edward Dennick, Yucca Valley; and James Dowdy, San Francisco.

Arturo Duran, San Francisco; Ramon Esparza, Pomona; Richard Esquilbel, San Jose; Jesus Estrada, Stockton; Ornelas Estrada, Inglewood; James Flemming, Palm Desert; Joseph Fortner, Blythe; Rodney Foster, Sacramento; Roy Gaines, Madera; Hortencia Gallardo, Oxnard; Gary German, Shasta County; Charles Gilliam, Los Angeles; Humberto Gonzales, Los Angeles; Johnny Gonzales, Sacramento; Iris Hamilton, Morongo Valley; Anthony Hernandez, Stockton; Terrell Huntley, Jr., Los Angeles; Gerald Huth, Paso Robles; Russell Johnson, Inglewood; and Steven Jones, Nicasio.

James Kunitz, Sacramento; Elsie Lewis, Pittsburg; Keith Lewis, Stockton; Leland John Lirette, Jr., Sacramento; John Liscano, Pomona; Anastacio Lizarraga, Bakersfield; Erlinda Lizarraga, Bakersfield; Abraham Lopez, Merced; Kenton Marlin, San Francisco; Jack Marquez, San Pedro; Michael Mattson, Pacifica; Marina Mayorga, Inglewood; Larry McGaughan, San Francisco; Joseph McGuffie, El Cajon; James Mozuraitis, Oakland; Aaron Nissenfeld, San Jose; Salvador Ochoa, Stockton; Janice Phillips, Port Hueneme; Robert Pimental, San Dimas; and Shirley Plowright, Hayward.

Monico Ramirez, Los Angeles; Raymond Ramirez, Monrovia; John Rehbock, Atascadero; Jose Rondinelli, Los Angeles; Robert Sakane, Hawthorne; Esmail Sanaipour, San Diego; Felipe Sanchez, Santa Ana; Joseph Sapp, Oakland; James Scalp, Ridgecrest; Saul Self, San Francisco; David Shiloh, San Francisco; Darlene Shipley, Oakdale; Vickie Jo Sprague, Wilmington; Nicole Starkes, San Francisco; William Steele, Long Beach; Peggy Trent, Santa Monica; Konstantinos Vagenas, South El Monte; Benjamin Valdez, Moss Landing; William Vaughn, San Bernardino; and Johnny Ray Vigil, Colton.

Francis Volk, Manteca; Jimmie Washington, Palo Alto; Harold Weinberg, Antelope Valley; George Williams, San Francisco; Larry Williams, Laurel Canyon; Raymond Wilson, Lodi; Wilda Wilson, Lodi; Unidentified male, 24, Santa Cruz; Unidentified female, San Gabriel; Unidentified male, San Gabriel; Unidentified male, 17, Pasadena; Unidentified male, 25, Long Beach; Unidentified male, 22, Los Angeles; Unidentified male, San Jose; and Unidentified male, 20, Sacramento.

COLORADO (14)

Joseph Burger, Grand Junction; Johnny Carroch, Poncha Springs; Paul Chavarria, Denver; Douglas Fairley, Arvada; James Koeln, Lyons; Robert Livingston, Denver;

David Millemon, Buena Vista; James Mountfort, Monte Vista; Paul Olschefske, Pueblo; Glen Pflug, Woodland Park; Timothy Sheldon, Branson; Douglas Stambaugh, Montrose; Joe Stribling, Denver; and Stuart Watkins, Denver.

CONNECTICUT (5)

Diane Flowers, New London; Joseph Johnson, New Haven; Theodore Schank, Stamford; Unidentified Male, 24, Hartford; and Unidentified Male, Hartford.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (12)

Shawn Better, George Coaxum, William Devereaux, Martin Garcia, Stanley T. Hall, Franklin Hammond, Mary Jackson, Carl K. Lane, Earl Mathews, Matilda Nesbitt, Robert Smith, and Richard K. Washington.

FLORIDA (24)

Albert Badger, Davie; Pamela Bailey, Miami; Pedro Cabejjon, Miami; Jean Capello, Deerfield Beach; Ray Cardinas, Vero Beach; Roberto Castro, Belle Glade; Maria Elsa Castro, Belle Glade; Ramon colmenares, Miami; Leon Colson, Oslo; Peter Deluca, Oakland Park; Eneidino Galinda, Wahneta; Clifford Givens, West Palm Beach; Randy Hammons, Bradenton; Ira Holland, Jacksonville; Joseph Jarret, Hudson; James Kearse, Fort Myers; James Lewis, High Springs; Raul Macho, Miami; Norman Martin, Miami; Ali Mohabbat, Miami; Delroy Murray, Miami; Albert Sawyer, Jacksonville; Robert Surgener, Deerfield Beach; and G. Eugene Woods, Ft. Lauderdale.

GEORGIA (24)

Samuel Alexandria, Atlanta; Robert Bell, Atlanta; James B. Brown, Jr., Chamblee; Agnes Burnett, Brunswick; Johnny Cope-land, Atlanta; Fay Garrison, Atlanta; Joseph Gibson, Atlanta; William Goulden, Atlanta; Frank Green, Newnan; James L. Hancock, Jr., Waynesboro; Andrew Heath, Cross Green; Jackie Mayam, East Point; Clarence McCormick, Columbus; William Pearce, Savannah; Gordon Salters, Augusta; Eddie Smith, Atlanta; Patricia Smith, Atlanta; Azzie Lee Stanford, Warrenton; Jerry Taylor, Haralson County; Clarence Toombs, Broxton; James B. Webster, Jr., Atlanta; Sherlyn Whitener, Dekalb County; Unidentified Male, 38, Atlanta; and Unidentified Male, 25, Coffee County.

HAWAII (5)

John Carson, Honolulu; Carl Greene, Honolulu; Alexander Kanehailua, Nanakuli Billy Jean Puulei, Wainiha; and Robert Stephenson, South Kona.

ILLINOIS (18)

Linda Carson, Chicago; Paul Chamberlain, East St. Louis; Victor Creswell, Chicago; Judy Graan, Chicago; Andrew Halliburton, Glencoe; Tina Hawkins, Chicago; Nathaniel Jackson, East St. Louis; Juan Jimenez, Chicago; Christine Mroz, Chicago; Edward O'Malley, Chicago; Aida Pagan, Chicago; William Pagan, Chicago; Lee Strong, Chicago; Ronald Turnbough, East St. Louis; William Walker, Jr., East St. Louis; Dennis Washington, East St. Louis; Audrey Weathers, Chicago; and Frazier Williams, Chicago.

INDIANA (10)

Larry Brodie, Indianapolis; Kenneth Chambers, Indianapolis; Kelly Clark, Evansville; Frankie Duncan, Evansville; Gregory Gilligan, Evansville; Lisa Gilligan, Evansville; Theresa Gilligan, Evansville; Jerry Keyes, South Bend; Joseph Semala, Michigan City; and Walter Trobaugh, Indianapolis.

IOWA (5)

Helen Bargenquast, Boone; Robert Bargenquast, Boone; Raymond Keller, Stockport, Steven Wellman, Council Bluffs; and Darnell Williams, Des Moines.

KANSAS (5)

Felix Brooks, Kansas City; Jose Perez, Lewis; Gayle Slater, Manhattan; Anthony Spray, Wichita; and Mary Walter, Great Bend.

KENTUCKY (11)

Stanley Allen, Florence; Pamela Barbour, Louisville; Everette Becknell, Lexington; Claude Canada, Nicholasville; Jesse Coleman, Cynthiana; Lonnie Hensley, Corbin; Rick Allen Johns, Covington; Timothy Mains, Covington; Raymond Marable, Russellville; Rebecca O'Hearn, Richmond; and James Ohler, London.

LOUISIANA (24)

Webster Antoine, Jr., New Orleans; Clifford Archilia, Lake Charles; Joel Bias, New Orleans; Albert Causey, Monroe; Larice Causey, Monroe; Madelyn Flaming, New Orleans; Harold Frank, New Orleans; John Hurst, Chalmette; Joe Jackson, New Orleans; Marguerite Jackson; Dorseyville; Beatrice King, Slidell; Reginald Lucas, New Orleans; Jeanne Marban, New Orleans; Terrell Martin, New Orleans; Robert McGuire, Gretna; Ackman Poche, Baton Rouge; Hilda Poche, Baton Rouge; Kevin Pollard, New Orleans; Roxanne Sebastine, Opelousas; Kenneth Septh, New Orleans; Reginald Simon, Scottsdale; Freddie Singleton, Pine Island; John Sullivan, New Orleans; and Joseph Tyler, Slidell.

MARYLAND (11)

Sammy Furr, Baltimore; Raymond Hudson, Baltimore; Kenneth Jackson, Baltimore; Robert Jones, Jr., Baltimore; Zeld Kay Jones, Baltimore; Albert Kahl, Baltimore; Lester King, Baltimore; Gary Miles, Baltimore; Nicholas Moneymaker, Baltimore; Hubert Pryor, Cambridge; and Cheryl Ann Tindall, Siloam.

MASSACHUSETTS (6)

Patricia Colini, Malden; Mary Cordeiro, Rehoboth; James DiGiovanni, Malden; Stephen Hughes, Boston; John H. Ryan, Boston; and Salvatore Sperlinga, Somerville.

MICHIGAN (13)

Edward Arnold, Detroit; William Bennett, Detroit; Kitty Brooks, Detroit; Ernest Brown, III, Detroit; Clarence Castelow, Detroit; Jim Crowley, Jackson; Barbara J. Davis, Grand Rapids; Mary Kathleen Maczuga, Warren; Fred Mead, Grand Rapids; Raymond Reece, Pontiac; Lela Belle Shy, Detroit; Unidentified male, 26, Saginaw; and Unidentified male, 36, Saginaw.

MINNESOTA (5)

Kenneth Bakken, Wayzata; Linda Coleman, Minneapolis; Thomas Luger, St. Paul; Harold Robinson, Henderson; and Dallas Wildey, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI (4)

Arthur Ray Butler, Jr., Petal; Walter Eugene Hall, Iuka; John Latham, Winona; and Suzanne Latham, Winona.

MISSOURI (18)

Tammy Lynn Blankenship, St. Robert; Cleo Margaret Breen, Versailles; A. J. Burnett, St. Louis; Mavis Coney, St. Louis; Billy Ray Francis, Waynesville; Lorna Sue Guess, St. Joseph; Ebony Hinton, St. Louis; Cynthia Howe, Kansas City; Larry Jones, St. Louis; Alfred Mayes, St. Louis; Larry Neal, St. Louis; Robert Parsons, Mitchell; Nathaniel Sledge, St. Louis; Olivia Stegall, Rock Hill; Michael Taylor, Rock Hill; Tamera Waltrip, Springfield; Unidentified male, 20s, St. Louis; and Unidentified male, 20, St. Joseph.

NEVADA (11)

Ralph Bailie, Reno; John Douglas Bell, Las Vegas; Eduardo Dominguez, Reno; Robert Flagg, Mason Valley; Gregory Lamb,

Las Vegas; Craig McClean, Reno; Anthony McRoy, Las Vegas; Deborah Ann Schlecht, Las Vegas; Randy Wheeler, Hawthorne; Vivian Wilson, Reno; and Stephen Young, Sparks.

NEW JERSEY (9)

Cecil Coates, Jr., Newark; Rayfield Coneley, Newark; Jack Gainer, Newark; Mr. Germain, North Bergen; Patty Hex, North Bergen; Thomas Jeffers, Newark; Lourdes Reyes, Jersey City; Ilda Rodriguez, Jersey City; and Craig Stevens, Newark.

NEW MEXICO (13)

Carol Gilbert, Los Lunas; Noel Johnson, Albuquerque; Kenn Johnson, Albuquerque; Wayne Knowles, Tucumcari; Steven Kourkoulis, Albuquerque; Ronnie Martinez, Albuquerque; Barbara McMullan, Albuquerque; David Miller, Vaughn; Rudy Sanchez, Jr., Carlsbad; Julian Uvalle, Clovis; Tranquillino Valdez, Roswell; Joe Vallejos, Roswell; and Delores Via, Albuquerque.

NEW YORK (32)

Aquiles Alcantara, New York; Mabel Benton, Ellenville; Arthur Benton, Ellenville; Wilfred Cade, Brooklyn; Ramon Denis, Brooklyn; Mario Gerabell, Brooklyn; Joe Jimenez, New York; Baby Johnson, Brooklyn; Lisa Johnson, Brooklyn; Kam Piu Liu, New York; Luis Lopez, Bronx; Salvatore Mannino, Queens; Isidore Martinez, New York; Raul Martinez, Brooklyn; Danny McGhee, Bronx; Ada McKinley, Ellenville; Tom Patterson, New York; Isaac Rackley, Queens; John Ramsden, Eastchester; Donald Reilly, Peekskill; Cecil Sledge, New York; Albert Soucht, New York; Kenneth Steward, New York; Otis Tisdale, Brooklyn; Loir Ubinas, Queens; Bridget Walsh, Garrison; Man Sze Wei, New York; Unidentified Male, Brooklyn; Unidentified Chinese Male, 34, New York; Unidentified Chinese Male, Brooklyn; Unidentified Chinese Male, Brooklyn; and Unidentified Male, 39, New York.

NORTH CAROLINA (17)

Walter Barringer, Charlotte; Henry Cotton, Jr., Durham; George Samuel Currin, Oxford; Vance Evans, Jr., Durham; James Farrar, Charlotte; Joe Ginyard, Jacksonville; Robert Hernandez, Johnston County; Selby Jones, Elizabeth City; Margaret Kendall, Albemarle; Moses Porter, Kingston; Claudia Priester, Columbia; W. Dwayne Riley, Stem; Timicca Rosemond, Winston-Salem; Michelle Shipman, Canton; Richard Stephens, Durham; Samuel Stubbs, Durham; and Virginia Wood, Durham.

NORTH DAKOTA (1)

Roberta Kyamme.

OHIO (10)

David Adams, Jackson Township; David Alcox, Oak Hill; Kenneth Bradley, North Hampton; Lonnie Carmon, Columbus; Betty Lowrei, Columbus; Shannon Maloney, Cincinnati; Mark Patterson, Columbus; Carrie Smith, Cleveland; Charles Smith, Springfield; and Felicia Thompkins, Cleveland.

OKLAHOMA (17)

John Abbott, Oklahoma City; Leroy Barnett, Tulsa; Reuben Farmer, Idabel; Barney Felixco, Oklahoma City; Henry Lee Johnson, Idabel; James Everett Kerr, Jr., Bethany; Chris Mills, Anadarko; Barbara Moore, Mustang; Ernest Earl Moore, Mustang; Ernest L. Moore, Mustang; Lenell Reynolds, Boley; Robert Wayne Sims, Ada; Debra Sweigart, Oklahoma City; Loren Tevebaugh, Nowata; Terry Williams, Oklahoma City; Unidentified Male, Oklahoma City; and Unidentified Male, Oklahoma City.

OREGON (7)

Shane Earl Agee, Alfalfa; Robert Baca, Portland; Myong Su Cho, Portland; Julia Ann Chen, Portland; Robert Goss, Florence;

James Edward Thompson, Portland; and Jeffrey Wayne Ward, Culver.

PENNSYLVANIA (10)

Samuel Andrews, Pittsburgh; Matthew Durkin, Philadelphia; Leonard Clifford Miller, Apollo; Marlene Newcomer, Fayette County; Rosario Rio de Maio, Morrisville; Baby Girl Ware, Pittsburgh; Fred Ware, Pittsburgh; Kimberly Ware, Pittsburgh; William Washington, Philadelphia; and Alfonso Westbrook, Philadelphia.

SOUTH CAROLINA (8)

Geraldine Andrews, Inman; Gordon Ausley, Greenville; Wade Delano Clark, Jonesville; Wesley Conwell, Myrtle Beach; Ralph A. Greene, Spartanburg; Paul Jones, Greenville; Marvin Smith, Greenville; and Ronnie Randy Smith, Hartsville.

TENNESSEE (31)

George Alexander, Memphis; Margie Barrett, Lebanon; James Beasley, Oak Ridge; Jimmy Phillip Blair, Knoxville; Hoyle Bowman, Elizabethton; Norman Budoff, Memphis; Brian Colegrove, Natchez Trace; Tommy Couch, McDonald; Jerry Deberry, Savannah; Joyce Shutt Dendy, Savannah; Curtis Deese, Nashville; Leon Goss Finley, Maryville; Mike L. Gibson, Martin; Herbert Good, Jr., Blountville; David Gladden, Chattanooga; John T. Hargis, Gallatin; Thomas James, Memphis; Jim Edna Jordan, Memphis; James Lossis, Kingsport; Andrew Martin, Great Smoky Mts. National Park; William McKnight, Nashville; Harry McMenemy, Memphis; Freddie Merriman, Spencer; Eugene Mitchell, Memphis; Jimmy Lee Sanders, Chattanooga; Paul Smith, Athens; John Raymon Sproul, Memphis; Gary Gene Walker, Altamont; Gary Calvin Woods, Memphis; Unidentified Male, Memphis; and Unidentified male, Memphis.

TEXAS (70)

Gilbert Alaman, Dallas; Earl Allen, Houston; Dorothy Arriola, Nacogdoches; George Arriola, Nacogdoches; Jesus Astorga, El Paso; Gene Balze, Alvin; Wanda Balze, Alvin; Jesus Balderas, Laredo; Fred Booth, Harlingen; Francine Bush, El Paso; Juan Carreon, Seminole; David Castor, Arlington; Epigmenio Castro, Matamoros; Bessie Davis, Dallas; Benny de la Ros, San Antonio; Alvin T. Domel, Georgetown; Jo Lynne Dyke, Austin; Ronald Ellis, Travis County; Walter Fenix, La Grange; Kelvin Franks, Greenville.

Candelario Garcia, Dallas; Joseph Robert Garner, Stockdale; Patsy Garner, Stockdale; Travis Garner, Stockdale; Brigette Gaskill, El Paso; Mario Guerrero, Groves; Totibio Hernandez, Houston; Justice Lee Jones, WACO; Aniceto Loreda, Matamoros; Guillermo Loreda, Matamoros; Michael Miller, Garland; Steve Montano, El Paso; Freddie Nixon, Dallas; James O'Brien, Texas City; Murray Oldham, Athens; Danny Pittman, Watauga; Larry Plunk, Angleton; Emmer Poke, Grand Prairie; Charles Puckett, Pasadena; Judith Puckett, Pasadena; Feliciano Ramirez, Matamoros; Hector Rincon, Houston; Jose Rios, Fort Worth; Fabian Rodriguez, Arcola; and Roderick Russell, Kilgore.

Alvaro Saenz, Houston; Frank Sandiford, Houston; Robert Scott, Galveston; Tommy Lee Scott, Dallas; Shirley Sessums, Overton; Walter Sessums, Jr., Overton; Thomas Shaw, III, San Antonio; Kenny Ray Short, Palestine; Dennis Smith, Pampa; Nathaniel Smitherman, Haltom; Roger Lynn Stone, Waco; Louis Tarrant, III, El Paso; Ricky Turner, Terrell; Jose Angel Vargas, Dallas; Jose Angel Villanueva, Austin; Harry Hartwell Wade, III, Fort Worth; Herbert Williams, San Antonio; Mattie Wilson, Terrell; Joe Lee Wishert, Levelland; Shannon Withers, El Paso; Susan Lynn Wolfe, Austin; C. J. Young, Collinsville; David

Zuber, Hurst; Andres Zuniga, Matamoros; and Unidentified Male, 30S, Travis County.

VIRGIN ISLANDS (2)

Caryl Baringer and Richard Baringer.

VIRGINIA (9)

Frederick Burhans, Fairfax; James Burnes, Charlottesville; Darryl Carter, Orange; E. Douglas Chumney, Blackstone; Hopkins Dicks, Sr., Richmond; Barbara Dillard, Richmond; Robert L. Harris, Richmond; Clayton Jenkins, Jr., Gloucester; and William Sitko, Fairfax.

WASHINGTON (9)

Randy Bailey, Spokane; Joseph D. Burr, Seattle; Audrey Lucille Ellis, Tacoma; Leonard Evans, Seattle; Harry Gee, Seattle; William Heeb, Tacoma; Marilyn Iachini, Wenatchee; Larry Jackson, Tacoma; and Dianne Saathoff, Silverdale.

WEST VIRGINIA (1)

Eddie Jude, East Kermit.

WISCONSIN (6)

Diane Benson, Franklin; Dennis Couillard, Kenosha; Charles Harmon, Milwaukee; Steven Mathews Franklin; Kevin Sanden, Buffalo County; and Lucretia Tate, Milwaukee.

WYOMING (3)

Celestine Allen, Rock Springs; Douglas McCarver, Glendo; and Rudohof Melendrez, Rock Springs.

THE \$341 MILLION THROWAWAY BILL

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1980

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, within my congressional district there stands a \$341 million project which, at this writing, is little more than a white elephant. In fact, the impotent status of that project has been noticed with frustration by many besides myself, including the editors of the Stockton Record. I would like at this time to share the Record's editorial with my colleagues.

The New Melones Dam is the project in question. Legislation is now pending before this House which is designed to prevent the dam from delivering the inherent benefits for which it was constructed.

First authorized in 1944 as part of the Flood Control Act, and authorized again in 1962 to expand the dam's beneficial role, the project is now completed at a cost of \$341 million. Ironically, the destructive and disastrous flooding which recently occurred in the San Joaquin-Sacramento Delta area dramatically underlined the imperative need for the dam's original purpose: flood control. However, New Melones is capable of many additional benefits: clean and cheap hydroelectric power at a time when energy is scarce, for one. It will also provide irrigation water supplies to agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, and the enhancement of fishery runs. Finally, many downstream areas are water-short, and would welcome the extra flows made possible by a full New Melones Reservoir.

However, the benefits of flood control and irrigation, of energy and recreation, may never be realized because of H.R. 4223. That legislation would include the 9-mile white water stretch behind the dam in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The bill is an outgrowth of rafting enthusiasts who feel it is more important to protect their exclusive boating activities than it is to permit this multimillion project to fulfill congressional intent, as well as the needs of the people.

I urge my colleagues to read the attached editorial, and to join the author, as well as myself, in asking if New Melones benefits should be "thrown out with the rafting water." I also urge my colleagues to join me in vigorous opposition to H.R. 4223.

The editorial follows:

[From the Stockton Record, Feb. 20, 1980]

THE \$341 MILLION THROWAWAY BILL

A Congress increasingly known for its special interest view of government is contemplating a way to lead this region down the river in a commercial raft.

Paddling this one in the spirit of popular environmentalism is sponsor Rep. Don Edwards, D-San Jose. His misguided measure would put a section of the Stanislaus River

into the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and turn the \$341 million New Melones Dam into a proverbial white elephant.

After languishing in committee for almost a year, Edwards' H.R. 4223 is set for hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. From the promethean height of Washington, members playing the game of mutual back-scratching in an election year will decide whether to kill a hydroelectric plant that could save 780,000 barrels of oil a year and provide flood control for more than 35,000 developed acres of farmland.

It could all happen if H.R. 4223 is approved. The law would prohibit filling New Melones beyond 808 feet. Above that level, a nine-mile stretch of white water would have to give way to progress.

What lies at the heart of this absurd piece of legislation is special interest politics abused to selfish purpose. H.R. 4223 takes its root from Friends of the River, the vocal group of white water enthusiasts, some of whom make their living off rafting parties. Claiming "unique geological, scenic, esthetic, historical, archeological, scientific, wild-life and recreational values of the river..." the bill would prohibit inundating nine miles of the Upper Stanislaus from Parrotts Ferry Bridge to Camp Nine.

We believe that Edwards and 11 other California congressmen support the bill out of misguided servitude to a self-proclaimed environmental viewpoint. But examination

of the facts shows that real environmental consciousness stands on the side of New Melones, whose full functioning would help save salmon, increase recreation in beautiful mountain backwaters, protect farmland below the dam and supplant oil-based energy.

Consider what will be lost if Congress decides to throw the New Melones' benefits out with the rafting water:

Electrical generating capacity of 400 million kilowatt hours of electricity—enough to supply 200,000 people or a city the size of Stockton. That translates into 780,000 barrels of fuel oil a year.

Improved water quality in the lower Stanislaus and downstream Delta areas when river flows slow down in the summer.

A chance to restore salmon runs up the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers.

H.R. 4223 represents the rafters' last ditch attempt to get from Congress what California voters rejected in Prop. 17 in 1974, what the state legislature rejected 18 months later, and what the U.S. Supreme Court concluded lacked even the merits required for an environmental impact statement.

Any Congressman—particularly those outside the region who have little understanding of the issue—should take a long look at the facts behind this boondoggle bill before he votes. Because support for H.R. 4223 should leave any legislator at election time up a creek without a paddle.●